

A. Berenson Recd. more 25 November 1917

T H E

W O R K S

O F T H E L A T E

M. D E V O L T A I R E.

T R A N S L A T E D F R O M T H E F R E N C H,

W I T H

N O T E S,

C R I T I C A L A N D E X P L A N A T O R Y.

B Y

The Rev. DAVID WILLIAMS.	ELIZABETH GRIFFITH.
HUGH DOWNMAN, M. A.	JAMES PARRY, M. A.
WILLIAM CAMPBELL, LL.D.	AND
RICHARD GRIFFITH, ESQ.	JOHN JOHNSON, M. A.

V O L. IV.

L O N D O N;

P R I N T E D F O R F I E L D I N G A N D W A L K E R,
P A T E R - N O S T E R - R O W.

M D C C L X X X.

34543.15

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

GIFT OF

BERNARD BERENSON

OCT 13 1938

On

I

Scar
few
of l
wh
no
A c
the
the
He
I
trif
he
his
"p
"p
is f

A N
E S S A Y

O N T H E

MANNERS and SPIRIT of NATIONS,

A N D

On the Principal Occurrences in History from
CHARLEMAGNE to LOUIS XIII.

C H A P. CLXXIV.

Of HENRY IV.

IN reading the History of Henry IV. in father Daniel, we are surprized not to find him a great man. Scarce do we perceive his character; we meet with very few of those beautiful replies which convey an image of his mind; not a word of that ever-memorable speech which he made to the assembly of the nobility at Rouen; no particulars of the great good he did his country. A dry account of military operations, long speeches to the parliament in favour of the Jesuits, and, in short, the life of father Coton, are the whole of the reign of Henry IV. in Daniel's history.

Bayle, an author oftentimes as censurable and as trifling upon points of history and political matters, as he is judicious and profound in disputes of logic, begins his article of Henry IV. with saying, "That if he had been made an eunuch when he was young, he might have eclipsed the glory of Alexander and of Cæsar." It is such things as these that Bayle ought to have struck
Vol. IV. *Gen. Hist.* B out

out of his Dictionary. Even his logic fails him in this ridiculous supposition; for Cæsar was far more debauched than Henry IV. and we can see no reason why the latter should have outdone Alexander. Does Bayle pretend to insinuate, that to be a great man one must be only half a man? Or, was he ignorant how many great leaders have joined love with war? Of all those who have gained themselves fame by their military achievements, Charles XII. is perhaps the only one who absolutely renounced all connections with the fair sex; and he met with more ill-fortune than success. Not that I have any inclination, in a work of this serious kind, to flatter the idle gallantry which has long been the reproach of the French nation. I only mean to enforce this great truth, that nature, who gives us all our qualifications, does almost always deny strength and courage to those who have been deprived of the marks of virility, or at least who have them imperfectly formed. Nature is the same through all the creation; it is not the ox, but the bull that fights. The powers both of body and mind depend upon this source of existence. We find only one general, Narfes, who was an eunuch, and only two learned men Origen and Photius. Henry IV. was frequently in love, and sometimes foolishly so; but he was never effeminate. The fair Gabriel calls him, in her letters, "My soldier." This appellation alone is sufficient to refute Bayle. It were to be wished, for the example of kings, and for the satisfaction of the public, that they would consult other authors, as Mezeray's great History, Perefex, and Sully's Memoirs, in regard to the reign of this excellent prince.

Let us, for our own particular use, draw up an abridgment of this life, which was a great deal too short. He was bred from his infancy in the midst of troubles and misfortunes. At the age of fourteen he was at the battle of Moncontour. He was called back to Paris, and married the sister to Charles IX. only to see his friends around him assassinated, to run the risk of his own life, and to be detained three years a
state-

state-prisoner. Released from confinement, he experienced all the fatigues and vicissitudes of war, oftentimes wanting the necessaries of life, never enjoying any repose, venturing his person like the boldest common soldier, and performing exploits that seem credible only by being repeated; as when at the taking of Cahors, in 1580, he was under arms five days successively, fighting from street to street, while he had scarce time to rest. The victory at Coutras was owing chiefly to his bravery: and his humanity after this battle ought to have gained him every body's affection.

Upon the murder of Henry III. he became king of Sept. France: but religion served as a pretence for one half 1589 of the leading men of the army to abandon him, and for the league not to acknowledge him as king. They chose for their sovereign a phantom, the cardinal of Bourbon-Vendome; and Philip II. king of Spain having bribed the leaguers, looked upon France as one of his provinces. The duke of Savoy, son-in-law of Philip, invaded Provence and Dauphiny. The parliament of Languedoc forbid his being recognized king upon pain of death, and declared him, "Incapable of ever possessing the crown of France, agreeably to the bull of our holy father the pope;" and the parliament of Rouen came to a resolution, that all his adherents were to be considered as traitors to their country.

Henry IV. had nothing to support him but the justice of his cause, his courage, and his friends. He was never in a condition to keep an army long on foot: and what sort of an army? It scarce ever amounted to twelve thousand men complete; which is less than the usual detachments in our times. His partisans came alternately to enlist under his banner, and returned alternately to their respective houses at the end of a few months service. The Swiss, whom he could hardly find money to pay, and a few companies of lancemen, formed the main of his standing forces. He was obliged to run about from town to town, to fight and negotiate without intermission. There is hardly a province in France,

France, in which he did not perform great feats, at the head of a handful of men.

08. He began with gaining a victory at Arques, in the 1589 neighbourhood of Dieppe, only with five thousand men, over the duke of Mayenne's army, which was five and twenty thousand strong. It was on this occasion, that he wrote the following letter to the marquis de Crillon: "Hang yourself, brave Crillon, for we have carried the day at Arques, and you was not there; adieu, my good friend, and believe me I love you sincerely." Soon after this, he made himself master of the suburbs of Paris, and only wanted a few more troops to take the town. He was obliged to retire, and to force his way through villages strengthened with entrenchments, in order to open a communication with the towns that supported his cause.

While he was thus continually exposed to fatigue and danger, cardinal Caëtan, the pope's legate, came quietly to Paris to prescribe laws in his holiness's name. The Sorbonne proclaimed aloud that he was no king; and the league reigned in triumph under the sanction of that cardinal Vendome, intitled Charles X. in whose name they coined money, while the king kept him confined at Tours.

The religious orders animated the people against him. The Jesuits ran from Paris to Rome, and to Spain. Father Matthew, who was called the *courier of the league*, was indefatigable in procuring bulls and soldiers. The king of Spain sent about four thousand horse, and three thousand of the old Walloon infantry under count Egmont, son of that very count whom he had caused to be beheaded. Henry IV. then drew his 14, few forces together, which did not amount to ten thousand 1590 combatants. He fought the famous battle of Ivry against the leaguers commanded by the duke of Mayenne, and against the Spaniards, who were greatly superior in number, in artillery, and in every thing requisite for maintaining a considerable army. He gained this battle in the same manner as he had gained that of Coutras, by breaking into the enemy's ranks through a forest

a forest of spears. Posterity will for ever remember these words of his; "If you lose your colours, remember to rally towards my white feather; you will be sure to find it in the road to honour and glory." "Save the Frenchmen," he cried out, when his victorious troops were hewing down the enemy.

It was not here as at Coutras, where he had hardly the command. He did not lose a moment, but immediately pursued his advantage. His army followed him with joy, and even received some reinforcements. But after all he had not fifteen thousand men: with these few troops he besieged Paris, which at that time contained two hundred and twenty thousand souls. He would certainly have taken it by famine, had not he himself, out of too great compassion, permitted the besiegers to feed the besieged. In vain did his generals, in compliance with his orders, issue out prohibitions upon pain of death, not to sell any provisions to the Parisians; the soldiers themselves supplied them for money. One day, when they were leading two country fellows to be hanged up as an example, for carrying some cart-loads of bread to a back-gate of that city, Henry met them in the way to his quarters; upon which they flung themselves upon their knees, and protested to him that they had only this method of getting their livelihood. "Go your ways in peace," said the king to them, giving them instantly all the money he had about him; "Henry of Bearn, added he, is poor; if he had more, he would give it you." It is impossible for a generous heart to read such passages without shedding tears of admiration and tenderness.

During the siege of Paris the monks went about in procession, armed with muskets, crucifixes, and cuirasses. The parliament, the superior courts, and the June citizens, swore upon the Evangelists, in the presence of 1590 the legate and the Spanish ambassador, never to admit him. But at length provisions fell short, and they began to feel the direful effects of famine.

Philip II. sent the duke of Parma with a numerous army to the relief of Paris. Henry IV. hastened to
give

give him battle. Every body must have heard of the letter, which he wrote from the intended field of battle to Gabrielle d'Estée, whom her royal lover will ever render famous in story: "If I die, my last thought will be on God, and the last but one on you." The duke of Parma refused to fight him; his errand was to relieve Paris, and to render the league more dependent on the king of Spain. To besiege this great city with so small a number of troops, before a superior army, was a thing impossible. Thus his prosperity was checked, and he was deprived of the fruit of his victories. However, he prevented the duke of Parma from making any conquests; and, following him close to the frontiers of Picardy, he obliged him to retire into Flanders.

Scarce was he delivered from this enemy, when pope Gregory XIV. of the family of Sfondrati, employed the treasures amassed by Sixtus V. to send a reinforcement of troops to the league. The Jesuit Jouvency, acknowledges in his history, that the Jesuit Nigri, superior of the novices of that order in Paris, assembled all of them that were in France and led them to meet the pope's army at Verdun, into which he incorporated them; and that this army marked its progress through the kingdom by the most terrible devastations. This circumstance sufficiently shews the spirit of those times.

The monks might then indeed, with some reason, say in their writings that the pope had a right to deprive kings, since he was on the point of establishing that right by the sword.

Henry IV. was constantly obliged to fight against Spain, Rome, and France; for the duke of Parma, when he retired, left eight thousand men with the duke of Mayenne. The pope's nephew entered France with Italian troops and monitories: and joined the duke of Savoy in Dauphiny. Lesdiguieres, he who was afterwards the last constable of France, and the last great lord, defeated the troops of Savoy and Rome. He carried on the war, like Henry IV. with officers, who served only upon occasion; and yet he beat those regular forces. Every man in France, whether peasant, artificer,

artificer, or burgher, was then a soldier: this laid the country waste, but prevented it from falling a prey to its neighbours. The pope's soldiers disbanded, after setting such examples of debauchery, as had been hitherto unknown on this side of the Alps. The inhabitants of the open country burnt the goats that followed their regiments.

Philip II. continued from his cabinet to feed and to stir up this fire, constantly supplying the duke of Mayenne with small succours, to prevent him from being either too weak or too strong; and expending great sums of money in Paris, in order to have his daughter Clara Eugenia recognized queen of France, in conjunction with the prince whom he intended for her husband. With this design he sent the duke of Parma once more into France, when Henry IV. laid siege to Rouen; as he had sent him before during the siege of Paris. He promised the leaguers that he would order an army of fifty thousand men to march to their assistance, as soon as his daughter was made queen. Henry, after raising the siege of Rouen, obliged the duke of Parma once more to retire out of France.

In the mean time the *faction of sixteen*, pensionaries of Philip II. were very near fulfilling the views of that monarch, and completing the entire ruin of the kingdom. They had hanged up the first president of the parliament of Paris, and two magistrates who opposed their treasonable designs. On the other hand the duke of Mayenne apprehensive of being crushed by this faction, had caused four of them to be served in the same manner. In the midst of this scene of distraction and horror, after the death of the pretended Charles X. a general assembly of the states was held at Paris under the direction of the pope's legate and the Spanish ambassador: the legate presided over the assembly, placing himself in the great chair, which had been left empty, to denote it belonged to the king who was to be elected. The Spanish ambassador had a seat there: he harangued against the Salic law, and proposed the infant for their queen. The parliament of Paris made remon-

frances to the duke of Mayenne in favour of the Salic law: but were not those remonstrances evidently concerted with this party leader? did not the nomination of the infanta deprive him of his post? did not the intended marriage of that princess to his nephew the duke of 1593 Guise, render him dependent, when he wanted to continue master?

We must not omit to remark, that the parliament wanted to set in the general assembly of the states by deputation or proxy, and that they could not obtain it. It is likewise observable that this very parliament had just before ordered a decree of the king's parliament (held at Chalons) against the pope's legate and his pretended power of presiding at the election of a king of France, to be burnt by the hands of the common executioner. Much about the same time, several of the citizens having presented a petition to the city and parliament, desiring that the king might at least be pressed to embrace the Roman Catholic religion, before they proceeded to the election; the Sorbonne declared this petition "Unfit, seditious, impious, and idle, inas-
" much as they well knew the obstinacy of Henry the
" apostate," at the same time excommunicating the authors of the petition, and banishing them out of the city. This decree, which was written in very bad Latin, and was certainly the production of weak and superstitious minds, is dated the first of November, 1592. It was afterwards revoked, when of very little signification whether it was or not; but had not Henry IV. enjoyed the crown, it would have continued in force, and Philip II. would have been loaded with the appellation of protector of France, and of the church.

The priests who sided with the league were persuaded, and endeavoured to persuade the people, that Henry IV. had no right to the throne: that the Salic law which had been so long respected, was only a chimera, and that the disposal of crowns was solely invested in the church.

There are still extant the writings of one Orleans, who was an advocate of the parliament of Paris, and a deputy

to

to the assembly of the states. This person explains the whole of this system in a large work, entitled, "The Answer of the true Catholics."

The art and fanaticism with which all the writers of that time endeavoured to support their argument by quotations from the Jewish books, are well worthy of our attention; as if the customs of a petty nation inhabiting the barren territory of Palestine ought, at the end of three thousand years, to be in any respect a guide to the kingdom of France. Thus, in order to exclude Henry IV. from this inheritance, we find them quoting the example of a petty Jewish king, named Uziah†, who was driven out of his palace by the priests because he had the leprosy, and who was afflicted with this disease as a punishment for having offered incense to the Lord. "Heresy, said they, is the leprosy of the soul; and consequently Henry IV. as being a leper, ought not to reign." Louis d'Orleans, in the work we have just now mentioned, reasons after the same manner; but on the subject of the Salic law it will be right to transcribe his own words. Thus, in page 224, he has the following expressions: "It is the duty of the king of France to be a christian as well as a male. He who believes not in the catholic, apostolic and Roman religion, neither believes in God, nor is a Christian, so that he cannot with justice be king of France any more than the greatest villain in the world." And in page 272 of the same work, we find the following passage which is still more extraordinary: "In order to be king of France, it is more requisite to be a good catholic than a man. Whosoever disputes this deserves rather to be answered by the hangman than by philosophers." Nothing can give us a clearer idea of the spirit of the times than these maxims, which had been in vigour at Rome for more than eight hundred years, and which had been rejected by the half of Europe only about a century before the period of which we are speaking. The Spaniards, by means of their

† 2 Chronicles, chap. xxvi.

frances to the duke of Mayenne in favour of the Salic law: but were not those remonstrances evidently concerted with this party leader? did not the nomination of the infanta deprive him of his post? did not the intended marriage of that princess to his nephew the duke of 1593 Guise, render him dependent, when he wanted to continue master?

We must not omit to remark, that the parliament wanted to set in the general assembly of the states by deputation or proxy, and that they could not obtain it. It is likewise observable that this very parliament had just before ordered a decree of the king's parliament (held at Chalons) against the pope's legate and his pretended power of presiding at the election of a king of France, to be burnt by the hands of the common executioner. Much about the same time, several of the citizens having presented a petition to the city and parliament, desiring that the king might at least be pressed to embrace the Roman Catholic religion, before they proceeded to the election; the Sorbonne declared this petition "Unfit, seditious, impious, and idle, inas-
" much as they well knew the obstinacy of Henry the
" apostate," at the same time excommunicating the authors of the petition, and banishing them out of the city. This decree, which was written in very bad Latin, and was certainly the production of weak and superstitious minds, is dated the first of November, 1592. It was afterwards revoked, when of very little signification whether it was or not; but had not Henry IV. enjoyed the crown, it would have continued in force, and Philip II. would have been loaded with the appellation of protector of France, and of the church.

The priests who sided with the league were persuaded, and endeavoured to persuade the people, that Henry IV. had no right to the throne: that the Salic law which had been so long respected, was only a chimera, and that the disposal of crowns was solely invested in the church.

There are still extant the writings of one Orleans, who was an advocate of the parliament of Paris, and a deputy
to

to the assembly of the states. This person explains the whole of this system in a large work, entitled, "The Answer of the true Catholics."

The art and fanaticism with which all the writers of that time endeavoured to support their argument by quotations from the Jewish books, are well worthy of our attention; as if the customs of a petty nation inhabiting the barren territory of Palestine ought, at the end of three thousand years, to be in any respect a guide to the kingdom of France. Thus, in order to exclude Henry IV. from this inheritance, we find them quoting the example of, a petty Jewish king, named Uziah†, who was driven out of his palace by the priests because he had the leprosy, and who was afflicted with this disease as a punishment for having offered incense to the Lord. "Heresy, said they, is the leprosy of the soul; and consequently Henry IV. as being a leper, ought not to reign." Louis d'Orleans, in the work we have just now mentioned, reasons after the same manner; but on the subject of the Salic law it will be right to transcribe his own words. Thus, in page 224, he has the following expressions: "It is the duty of the king of France to be a christian as well as a male. He who believes not in the catholic, apostolic and Roman religion, neither believes in God, nor is a Christian, so that he cannot with justice be king of France any more than the greatest villain in the world." And in page 272 of the same work, we find the following passage which is still more extraordinary: "In order to be king of France, it is more requisite to be a good catholic than a man. Whosoever disputes this deserves rather to be answered by the hangman than by philosophers." Nothing can give us a clearer idea of the spirit of the times than these maxims, which had been in vigour at Rome for more than eight hundred years, and which had been rejected by the half of Europe only about a century before the period of which we are speaking. The Spaniards, by means of their

† 2 Chronicles, chap. xxvi.

treasure and the religious orders, gave weight to these opinions in France; and yet Philip II. would have supported very opposite principles if he could have had the least interest in so doing.

While Henry's adversaries were employing the sword and the pen, politics and superstitions against him, and while this assembly of the states, so tumultuous and irregular in their proceedings, were debating at Paris, Henry was still at the gates, threatening to enter the city. He had several adherents within the walls. Many of the honest citizens, tired of their calamities and of a foreign yoke, sighed after peace; but the common people were restrained by religion. In this respect, the vulgar in all countries prescribe laws to the great and the wise: they constitute the largest number; they hurry on precipitately; they are fanatic; and the situation of Henry IV. did not enable him to imitate the example of Henry VIII. or queen Elizabeth. He was therefore obliged to change his religion; a thing ever disagreeable to a gallant man. The laws of honour, which never vary among polite nations, while every thing else is subject to change, have rendered such a step in some measure disgraceful, when dictated by interest. But this interest was so considerable, so general, and so strongly connected with the welfare of the kingdom, that the best friends he had among the Calvinists advised him to embrace the religion which they detested. "It is necessary, said Roni to him, that you should be a papist, and that I continue a protestant." This was what the league and the Spanish faction were most afraid of. The names of *heretic* and *apostate*, were their principal arms, which his conversion rendered useless. He was obliged to be instructed, but only for form's sake; for indeed he knew more of the matter already than the bishops with whom he conferred. His mother had bred him up in the knowledge of the Old and New Testament, in both which he was thoroughly versed. Controversy had been as much the subject of conversation in his own party, as war and love. Quotations from the Bible, and allusions to this book, entered into the

the composition of what they called a *fine wit* in those days: and so familiar was the scripture to Henry IV. that at the battle of Coutras, upon taking an officer prisoner, whose name was Chateaurenard, he cried out to him, *Surrender, Philistine.*

His opinion concerning this conversion, appears plain July enough by a letter to Gabrielle d'Estrée: "To-morrow ^{24,}
" I am to take the dangerous leap. I think these peo- ¹⁵⁹³
" ple here will make me hate S. Denis, as much as you
" hate Monceaux" It is sacrificing truth to false decorum, to pretend with father Daniel, that Henry IV. had been a catholic in his heart long before his conversion: his conversion, without doubt, secured his eternal welfare; but the measure was probably adopted only from motives of convenience, and it is certain that it did not at all strengthen his right to the crown.

He had at that time about his person a private envoy from queen Elizabeth, named Thomas Vilquesy, who, in a letter he wrote to his royal mistress, concerning the king's changing his religion, has these words:
" The following is the manner in which this prince excuses himself, on account of his change of religion,
" and the very words in which he expressed himself to
" me* :

" When I came to the crown eight hundred gentlemen and nine regiments left my service, on pretence
" that I was an heretic; the leaguers immediately set
" about choosing another king, and the most powerful
" of them offered their services to the duke of Guise;
" whereupon I determined, after mature deliberation,
" to embrace the Romish religion, and by that step I
" have entirely won over the third party, have prevented the election of the duke of Guise, and have
" gained the good-will of the French nation. I have
" had the promise of the duke of Florence, in regard to
" some matters of great importance, and in short have
" prevented the reformed religion from being entirely
" rooted out."

* Copied from the third volume of Beze's MSS. No. 8. V.

Henry † sent the Sieur Morland to the queen of England, to inform her of what had passed, and to make his excuses to her as well as he could. Morland tells us, that Elizabeth made him this reply, "Is it possible then, that any worldly consideration can have made him lay aside the fear of God?" When we hear the murderers of Mary Stuart talking of the fear of God, we cannot help thinking the character of a hypocrite, which has been given her by many historians, to be too true; but, when we hear the brave and generous Henry IV. declaring that he had changed his religion merely from political motives, which are the sovereign principle with all crowned heads, we cannot doubt that he spoke from his heart. How then can the Jesuit Daniel offer so glaring an insult to truth, and to the understanding of his readers, as to assert, even against all probability, a cloud of witnesses, and the principles of the human mind, that Henry IV. had long been a catholic in his heart? This sufficiently shews, that the count de Boulainvilliers was perfectly in the right, when he asserted, "That no Jesuit could be a faithful historian."

The conferences that were held with Henry IV. rendered his person dear to every body that went out of Paris to see him. One of the deputies being surprized at the familiarity with which his officers pressed round him, so as hardly to leave room enough for his majesty: "This is nothing at all, said the king, they press round me much closer in time of battle." At length having retaken the town of Dreux by storm, befor he learnt his new catechism, he made his abjuration at S. Denis, and was crowned at Chartres: by these preparatory steps, and especially by the intelligence he had established in Paris, which was garrisoned with three thousand Spaniards, besides some Neapolitans and Lansquenets, he entered the city as sovereign, with no more troops about his person, than there were foreigners within the walls.

† Copied from the third volume of Beze's MSS. No. 8. V.

Paris had neither seen nor acknowledged a king these fifteen years. This revolution was conducted by two men only, the marshal de Brissac, and a brave citizen of a less illustrious name, though not less noble a soul, a sheriff of Paris, named l'Anglais. These two restorers of the public tranquillity, soon formed an association with the magistrates and principal citizens. Their measures were so well concerted; the legate, cardinal de Pellevé, the Spanish officers, and the *sixteen* were so artfully deceived, and afterwards so overawed, that Henry IV. made his public entry into his capital, almost without any effusion of blood. He sent back all the foreigners, though he might have kept them prisoners; and he pardoned all the leaguers. The ambassadors of Philip II. left Paris the very day that Henry IV. made his entry into that city, without having the least violence offered to their persons; only the king, as he saw them passing by a window where he was standing, called out to them, "Gentlemen, pray give my compliments to your master; but I desire you never to come here again."

Tues-
day,
Mar.

12,
1594

Several cities followed the example of Paris; but Henry was still far from being master of the kingdom. Philip II. with a view of rendering himself necessary to the league, had never done all the harm he could to the king; but now he exerted himself in several provinces. Disappointed of his expectation of reigning over France, under the name of his daughter, he bent his whole attention towards weakening the kingdom by a dismemberment; so that France was like to be reduced to a worse condition, than when the English were in possession of one moiety of the country, and the petty lords tyrannized over the other.

The duke of Mayenne had Burgundy; the duke of Guise, son to him who was surnamed *the Scarred*, was master of Rheims, and part of Champagne; the duke of Mercœur was in possession of Britany; and the Spaniards had Blavet in the same province, now Port Louis. Even the principal officers under Henry IV. thought of making themselves independent. The calvinistical

vinistical party whom he had deserted, were fortifying themselves in their respective provinces against the leaguers, and providing resources to oppose one day the royal authority.

Henry IV. was obliged to have recourse to as many intrigues as battles, in order to recover his kingdom by degrees. Notwithstanding that he was in possession of Paris, his power for some time was so unsettled, that pope Clement VIII. constantly refused to grant him absolution, which in more fortunate times the king would not have wanted. None of the religious orders prayed for him in their convents, nor was his name ever introduced by the secular clergy in their prayers, till the year 1606, when the parliament issued an arret, enjoining them to revive the prayer for the king. In short, the epidemical distemper of fanaticism had taken so deep root in the minds of the catholic populace, that scarce a year passed without their plotting to destroy him. His whole life was spent in fighting against one chief or another, in conquering, in pardoning, in negotiating, and in purchasing the submission of his enemies. Who could have imagined that it cost him thirty-two millions of livres to satisfy the pretensions of so many lords? This appears from the Memoirs of the duke of Sully: and those engagements were punctually discharged, when at length being settled in full peace and authority on the throne, he might have refused to pay this price of rebellion. The duke of Mayenne did not come to an accommodation with him till 1596. Henry was sincerely reconciled to him, and gave him the government of the isle of France. After having tired him one day with a walk, he said to him, "Cousin, "this is the only harm I'll do you while I live;" and he kept his word, which, indeed, he never broke to any body.

Several politicians have pretended that when this prince was securely fixed on the throne, he ought to have imitated queen Elizabeth, and have entirely separated his kingdom from the Romish communion. They observe

ob
too
an
hav
ren
Bu
as
par
was
arm
the
I
and
reig
vera
wer
pre
tant
thor
The
squa
pub
cil o
T
some
him
agai
and
ceiv
mers
rever
the
king
him,
share
alien

*
siege
1593.
V

observe that the balance of power in Europe inclined too much in favour of Philip II. and the catholics; and that to have kept this balance equal, he ought to have made the French protestants, as the only means of rendering them a numerous, rich and powerful people. But Henry IV. was far from being in the same situation as queen Elizabeth. He had not at his command a parliament of the nation attached to his interests; he was in want of money, and had but an inconsiderable army; Philip II. was perpetually at war with him, and the leaguers were still powerful and in high spirits.

He recovered his kingdom, but in the same ruinous and exhausted state in which it had been during the reigns of Philip of Valois, John, and Charles VI. Several high roads were covered with briars: and ways were opened through fallow lands. Paris, which at present contains above seven hundred thousand inhabitants, had* not more than an hundred and fourscore thousand when Henry IV. made his entry into that city. The revenues of the state, which had been wantonly squandered under Henry III. were now no more than a public traffic of the blood of the people, which the council of finances shared with the farmers of the revenue.

The queen of England, the great duke of Tuscany, some of the German princes, and the Dutch had lent him money, with which he had maintained himself against the league, against Rome, and against Spain; and in order to pay those lawful debts, the general receiver's office and the crown lands were resigned to farmers for those foreign powers, who administered the revenue in the very heart of the kingdom. Several of the leading men of the league, who had made their king pay for that allegiance which they naturally owed him, kept likewise receivers of the public money, and shared this branch of sovereignty. The farmers of those alienated duties plundered the people of four times

* There were 220,000 souls in Paris, when that city was besieged by Henry IV. in 1590. There were only 180,000 in 1593. V.

more than their demand amounted to; and when at length the general depredation obliged Henry IV. to give the intire administration of the finances to the duke of Sully, this able and upright minister found that in the year 1596, they raised about a hundred and fifty millions of livres on the people, to bring thirty into the treasury.

Had not Henry IV. been the bravest, the most merciful, and the most upright prince of his time, as well as the honestest man, his kingdom would have been ruined. France stood in need of a prince, capable of conducting it in war and peace, of probing the wounds of the state, and applying proper remedies; of giving his attention to matters of small as well as great concern, capable in short of every thing; and such a prince was Henry IV. He united the prudent administration of Charles the Sage, with the valour and frankness of Francis I. and the good nature of Louis XII.

In order to provide against such a number of exigences, and to be able to transact so many treaties as well as to carry on so many wars, Henry convened a meeting of the chief nobility of the kingdom; it was a kind of states-general. The speech he made them is still engraved in the memory of every good citizen, acquainted with the history of his country. "Already
" by the protection of heaven, by the counsels of my
" faithful servants, and by the sword of my brave nobility, between whom and my princes I make no
" distinction, the appellation of gentleman being our
" noblest title, have I drawn this state out of servitude
" and ruin. I would willingly restore it to its former
" vigour and lustre; and that you should partake of
" this second glory as you have shared the first. I have
" not called you together as my predecessors used to
" do, to oblige you blindly to approve my will, but
" to take your opinion, to follow it, and to put myself
" under your direction. This is what seldom comes
" into the head of kings, of conquerors, or of grey-
" beards: but the love I bear my people, enables me

" to

"
Th
per

dar
hab
selv
suc
plu
rev
distr
mis
was
blec
of
with
por
" t
self
" w
" to
the
supp
gero
was
neces
nobi
A
care
he r
thirt
the f
and
each
their
care
H
bert
tence
all F

“ to do every thing, and to look upon it as honourable.” This eloquence of the heart from a heroe is greatly superior to all the harangues of antiquity.

In the midst of these troubles, and continual Mar. dangers, the Spaniards surprized Amiens, the in-1527 habitants of which had undertaken to defend themselves. This unhappy privilege, of which they made such bad use, was the cause of their town being plundered, while it exposed all Picardy to danger, and revived the efforts of those who were still desirous of dismembering France. Henry, when the news of this misfortune reached him, had no money, and besides was in a bad state of health. Nevertheless he assembled a few troops, and marched towards the frontiers of Picardy; thence he flew back to Paris, and wrote with his own hand to the parliaments, and to the corporations, “ To get bread to feed those who defended “ the state:” these are his own words. He went himself to the parliament of Paris, where he said, “ If you “ will give me an army, I will freely venture my life “ to save you, and to relieve the state.” He proposed the creation of new offices, in order to raise the necessary supplies: but the parliament finding this method dangerous, refused to register the edicts; so that the king was obliged to exert his whole authority to find the necessary funds, for venturing his life at the head of his nobility.

At length, what by loans, and by the indefatigable care of that worthy servant of his, Roni duke of Sully, he raised a fine army. This was the only one for these thirty years that was provided with all necessaries, and the first that had a regular hospital, in which the sick and wounded had proper assistance. Before that time each company or troop took what care they could of their wounded; and as many perished through want of care as by the sword.

Henry retook Amiens in sight of the archduke Albert, and obliged him to retire. From thence he hastened to settle the rest of the kingdom; and at length Sep. all France submitted to his government. The pope, 1597
D 2 who

who had refused him absolution before he was settled on the throne, was pleased to grant it, when he saw him crowned with victory. Nothing more remained, than
 May 2, to conclude a peace with Spain; which he did at Ver-
 1598 vins: and this was the first advantageous treaty that France had made with its enemies since the reign of Philip Augustus.

From that time forward he placed all his care in polishing and improving this kingdom, which he had acquired by the point of his sword: the useless troops were disbanded; order was introduced into the revenue after the most abominable peculations; and by degrees he paid all the debts of the crown without oppressing the people. The peasants to this day, remember a saying of his, "That he should be glad to see them have a fowl upon the table every Sunday;" the expression is trivial, but the sentiment, paternal. It was a thing highly worthy of admiration, that notwithstanding the exhausted and desolate state, in which he found the kingdom, he should, in less than fifteen years time have been able to ease the burthen of the *taille*, or land-tax, by near four millions of livres of the currency of his time, which would make ten of ours; to lessen the other duties one half, and to pay off an hundred millions of the crown debts, which would make two hundred millions of the present money. He redeemed lands which are now alienated, to the amount of more than an hundred and fifty of our millions; all the strong places were repaired, the magazines and arsenals well filled, and the highways repaired; all which is to the immortal glory of the duke of Sully, and of his royal master, who had the courage to make choice of a soldier, to repair the disorders in the public finances; and who did not disdain to labour in concert with the minister of his choice.

The law was reformed, and what seems more difficult, the people of both religions lived peaceably together, at least in appearance. Trade and the polite arts were encouraged. Gold and silver stuffs, which
 had

had been prohibited by a sumptuary edict in the beginning of a troublesome reign, and in times of distress, began to appear with splendor, and to enrich Lyons and France. He erected manufactures of silk and woollen tapestry. They began to make small looking-glasses in the Venetian taste. To him only we are indebted for our silk worms, for our plantations of mulberry-trees, notwithstanding the opposition of Sully, a man more valuable for his fidelity and skill in administering the revenue, than fond of novelties.

Henry cut the canal of Briare, by which the Seine and the Loire are joined. Paris was enlarged and embellished: the Place Royale was laid out; and all the bridges were repaired. The suburb of St. Germain did not join the town; nor was it paved. The king undertook the whole. He erected that fine bridge*, where the people still look with an eye of tenderness on his statue. St. Germain, Monceaux, Fontainebleau, and especially the Louvre, were enlarged and almost new built. He allotted apartments in the Louvre to artists of every kind. They were lodged under that long gallery, which was erected by him; and he encouraged them by his visits, as well as by honours and rewards. In a word he was the real founder of the royal library.

When don Pedro de Toledo was sent ambassador by Philip III. to Henry IV. he did not know this town again, which he had formerly beheld in so low and wretched a condition: "It is because the father of the family was not there at that time," said Henry to him, "but now that he has the care of his children, they thrive and prosper." Sports, festivals, and balls, which Catherine de Medicis had introduced to court in times of trouble, were now applied to adorn these happy and peaceful days under Henry IV.

While thus he promoted the prosperity of his own state, he was the arbiter of others. Little did the court of Rome imagine, at the time of the league, that

* Alluding to the Pont Neuf. T.

Henry of Bearn would be the pacifier of Italy, and the moderator between her and Venice. Yet pope Paul V. was extremely fortunate in applying to Henry, to extricate him out of the difficulty into which he had involved himself by excommunicating the doge and senate, and by laying the state of Venice under what they call an interdict, for a dispute about incontestable rights, which the senate maintained with their usual vigor. The king was arbiter of the difference. He whom the popes had excommunicated, got the excommunication of Venice taken off †.

† Father Daniel relates a fact that appears very extraordinary; and he is the only one that mentions it. He pretends that Henry IV. after having reconciled the pope to the republic of Venice, spoiled this accommodation himself, by communicating to the pope's nuncio at Paris an intercepted letter from a minister of Geneva, wherein he boasted that the doge of Venice, and several senators were protestants in their hearts; that they only waited for a favourable opportunity to declare themselves; that father Fulgentio of the order of Servites, companion and friend of the celebrated Sarpi, so well-known by the name of Fra. Paolo, *was labouring hard in this same vineyard.* He adds that Henry IV. ordered his ambassador to shew this letter to the senate, only leaving out the name of the doge. But when Daniel has given the substance of this letter, in which the name of Fra. Paolo is not to be found, he says nevertheless that this same Fra. Paolo was accused in the copy of the letter shewn to the senate. He does not mention the name of the Calvinistical minister, who wrote this letter, which is said to have been intercepted. It is likewise observable, that this letter related to the Jesuits, who were banished from the Venetian dominions. In a word, Daniel makes use of this pretended step of Henry IV. as a proof of that prince's zeal for the catholic religion. It would have been a strange sort of zeal in Henry IV. thus to create inquietude in the senate of Venice his best ally, and to blend the mean character of a shuffler with the glory of a mediator. I own there might have been a letter, real or forged, from a minister at Geneva, and even that this letter might have produced some little intrigues extremely indifferent to the grand object of history; but it is not at all probable that Henry IV. should descend so far beneath himself, as to commit the dirty action of which Daniel does him the honour. He further adds, "That whoever keeps up a connexion with heretics, either is of their religion, or
" has

He protected the infant republic of Holland, assisted her with money, and contributed not a little to her being recognized by Spain a free and independent state.

His glory was therefore established both at home and abroad; so that he passed for the greatest man of his time. The reputation of the emperor Rodolphus, was confined to natural philosophers and chemists. Philip II. was never in battle: besides after all, he was only a dark dissembling, active tyrant; and his prudence could never be compared to the valour and frankness of Henry IV. who, with all his follies, was as good a politician as Philip. Elizabeth acquired great reputation; but, not having met with the same difficulties, she could never pretend to the same degree of glory. Her real merit was diminished by the hypocritical artifices with which she is charged; and stained by the blood of Mary Stuart, which can never be washed out. Sixtus V. got a name by the obelisks which he raised, and by the monuments with which he adorned the city of Rome. Setting aside this kind of merit, far inferior to the former, he would never have been known, but for having mounted the papal throne by fifteen years dissembling, and for a severity that bordered upon cruelty.

They who reproach Henry IV. so bitterly for his amours, do not reflect that his foibles were such as are incident to the best of men, and that none of them hindered him from attending to the affairs of government. This appeared very plain, when he was preparing to be the arbiter of Europe, upon the dispute concerning the succession of Juliers. It is an absurd calumny of le Vassor, and some other compilers, to say that Henry was going to embark in this war for the sake of the young princess of Condé: we ought to believe the duke

"has none at all." This odious reflexion makes even against Henry IV. who of all men in his time had the most numerous connexions with the reformed. We could have wished that father Daniel had entered into the particulars of the administration of Henry IV. and of the duke of Sully, rather than into those mean trifles which discover more partiality than justice, and prove the author to have been more a Jesuit, than a lover of his country. V.

of

of Sully, who acknowledges the weakness of this monarch, and proves at the same time that no amorous passion was mingled with his grand designs. It was not surely for the princess of Condé that Henry concluded the treaty of Cherasco, that he made sure of all the Italian powers, and of the princes of Germany, and that he was attaining the height of his glory, while he held the balance of Europe.

He was ready to march into Germany at the head of forty-six thousand men. Every circumstance seemed to bid fair for success; a reserve of forty millions of livres in his coffers; immense preparations; strong alliances; able generals formed under himself; the protestant princes of Germany, and the new republic of the united provinces, ready to concur in his measures. The pretended division of Europe into fifteen states, is acknowledged to be a chimera that could not enter into his head. Had there ever been any negotiation on foot in regard to so extraordinary a design, some traces of it would have appeared in England, Venice, or Holland, in concert with whom Henry is supposed to have planned this revolution: but there is not the least vestige of it to be found; therefore the project is neither true nor probable. However, by means of his alliances, as well as by his arms and his œconomy, he was going to change the system, and to render himself the arbiter of Europe; which would have raised him to the summit of glory.

Were we to draw this faithful portrait of Henry IV. in the hearing of a sensible foreigner, who had never before been acquainted with his name, and were to conclude with telling him; this is the very man who was assassinated in the midst of his people, and whose life was attempted several times before, by persons, to whom he had never done the least harm; it would be impossible for him to believe it.

How lamentable is it that the same religion, which enjoins the forgiving of injuries, should have been so long the cause of committing so many murders, and in virtue of this maxim only, that whoever does not think

as

as we do is damned, and that we ought to hold the damned in detestation.

What is more extraordinary, the catholics did not conspire against the life of this good king, till he became of their religion. The first who attempted to assassinate him, at the very time he was making his abjuration at St. Denis, was a wretch from the scum of the people, named Peter Barriere. He had some scruple upon his mind when the king had abjured: but he was confirmed in his design by the most furious of all the leaguers, Aubri, curate of St. André des Arts; as also by a Capuchin friar, by a secular priest, and by Varade, rector of the college of Jesuits. The celebrated Stephen Paquier, advocate-general of the chamber of accounts, declares he had heard from Barriere's own mouth, that Varade had spurred him on to commit the crime. This accusation receives a new degree of probability from the absconding of Varade and the curate Aubri, who took shelter at the cardinal legate's, and attended him in his return to Rome, at the time that Henry IV. made his entry into Paris. In a word, what corroborates this probability, Varade and Aubri were afterwards quartered in effigy by a decree of the parliament of Paris, as related in Henry IVth's journal. Father Daniel uses some endeavours to exculpate the Jesuit Varade: but the secular clergy have recourse to no artifices to justify the mad priests of that time; the Sorbonne confesses its odious decrees; while the Dominicans agree, that their brother Clement assassinated Henry III. and that he had been incited to commit this parricide by father Bourgoin, his prior. The truth should prevail over every other consideration; hence, it declares that none of the present clergy ought to be reproached with the sanguinary maxims and barbarous superstition of their predecessors, since they all abhor them: it only preserves the remembrance of those crimes, to the end that they may never be an object of imitation.

The spirit of fanaticism was so generally diffused throughout the kingdom, that a silly Carthusian, named Quin, was deluded to such a degree, as to fancy he

should take flight directly to heaven, by killing Henry IV. The wretch was confined as a madman, by order of his superiors. In the beginning of 1599, two Dominican friars of Flanders, one named Arger, the other Ridicovi, of Italian extraction, resolved to follow the example of their brother, James Clement: the plot was discovered; and the gallows prevented their committing the atrocious deed. This execution did not terrify a Capuchin friar, who travelled from Milan to Paris with the same design, and underwent the same punishment. The vicar of St. Nicholas des Champs, and a tapestry maker, likewise meditated the same crime, and met with a similar fate.

Dec. 27, 1594 Of all the attempts to assassinate this prince, that of John Chatel is the strongest proof of the reigning madness of the times: born of a genteel family, of rich parents, carefully educated, young and unexperienced, being under nineteen, it was impossible he should have formed of himself so desperate a resolution. It is well known that he struck the king with a knife in the Louvre; and that the reason of his hitting him on the mouth, was because that good prince, having been accustomed to embrace his servants who came to pay their court to him after a long absence, was at that time stooping to embrace Montigni.

Upon his first interrogatory he maintained, "That he had done a good action, and that as the king had not as yet been absolved by the pope, he might kill him with a safe conscience:" this alone is a sufficient proof of his having been seduced.

This person had studied some time at the Jesuits college. Among the dangerous superstitions of those days there was one capable of turning people's brains; this was the chamber of spiritual exercises, to which young people used to retire for meditation: the walls were painted with devils, torments, and hell-flames, discerned by a dim light: weak imaginations were often affected with this scene to a degree of madness: this madness had so far operated on the brain of this poor wretch, that he believed he should escape hell by murdering his sovereign.

There

There is no doubt but the judges would have been deficient in their duty, if they had not examined into the papers of the Jesuits ; especially after John Chatel had confessed, that he had frequently heard some of those fathers say that it was lawful to kill the king.

Among the papers of the professor Guignard, these very words were found in his own hand-writing, that, " Neither Henry III. nor Henry IV. nor queen Elizabeth, nor the king of Sweden, nor the elector of Saxony, were lawful sovereigns ; that Henry III. was a Sardanapalus, Henry of Bearn a fox, Elizabeth a she-wolf, the king of Sweden a griffin ; and the elector of Saxony a hog : " this was called eloquence. " James Clement," he said, " has done an heroic act, inspired by the Holy Ghost ; if we can carry on the war against Henry of Bearn, let us ; if not, let us kill him."

Guignard was very imprudent not to burn the writing, the very instant he heard of Chatel's attempt. They seized his person, together with that of Gueret, professor of an absurd jargon which they called philosophy, and of which Chatel had been long time student. Guignard was hanged and burnt ; but Gueret, having confessed nothing upon the rack, was only sentenced to be banished the kingdom, with the rest of the Jesuits.

Surely prejudice must raise a very thick mist before one's eyes, when the Jesuit Jouvency, in his history of that society, compares Guignard and Gueret to the primitive Christians persecuted by Nero. He commends Guignard especially for having refused to ask pardon of the king and of justice, when he was exposed, previous to his execution, with a torch in his hand and his writings at his back. He represents Guignard as a martyr who asked forgiveness of God, because it was possible he might be a sinner ; but who could not against his conscience acknowledge that he had offended the king. How could he have offended him more, than by teaching that he ought to be assassinated ; unless he had committed the assassination ? Jouvency considers the arrest

of the parliament as a very iniquitous sentence: "*Memimus*, says he, & *ignoscimus*: we remember, and we forgive." It is true, the sentence was severe, but surely it could not be unjust, when we consider the papers of the Jesuit Guignard, the violent principles of Hay another Jesuit, the confession of John Chatel, the writings of Toletus, Bellarmin, Mariana, Emanuel Sa, Suarez, Salmeron, Molina, the letters of the Jesuits of Naples, and so many other pieces, in which this doctrine of regicide is established. It is very true that no particular Jesuit had ever advised Chatel to commit this act; yet it is also true that while he studied among them he had heard this doctrine, which at that time was but too common.

How can the banishment of the Jesuits be looked upon as unjust in those days, when we do not complain of the sentence of exile inflicted upon John Chatel's father and mother, though guilty of no other offence, than that of bringing into the world a wretch whose head was turned? Those unfortunate parents were fined and banished, their house was demolished, and on the spot where it stood a pyramid was erected, on which the crime and the sentence were engraved. This inscription mentioned, "That the court had sentenced to perpetual banishment this society of late invention, this spawn of diabolical superstition, for having excited John Chatel to commit that horrid parricide." It is further worthy of observation, that the sentence of parliament was put into the *Index* at Rome. Hence it appears that those were times of fanaticism; that though the Jesuits might not teach a more horrid doctrine than the rest, yet they seemed to be a more dangerous set of men, because they had the care of the education of youth; that they were punished for past faults, which three years before were not looked upon at Paris as criminal; in a word, that the calamity of the times rendered this decree of the parliament necessary. It was so much so that at that time there appeared an apology for John Chatel, in which it is said, "That his attempt was a virtuous, heroic, and meritorious act; worthy to be compared

“ compared to the noblest deeds recorded in sacred or
“ profane history, and that one must be an atheist to
“ doubt it. There is but one thing, adds the apologist,
“ which can be found fault with, and this is, that
“ Chatel did not complete what he had begun, by
“ sending the apostate to his proper place with Judas.”

This apology clearly shews that the reason why Guignard could never be brought to ask forgiveness of Henry IV. was, that he did not look upon him as king. “ The constancy of this holy man,” says the author of the apology, “ would never suffer him to acknowledge one whom the church did not acknowledge; and although the judges condemned his body to be burnt, and his ashes to be scattered in the air, yet will his blood never cease to cry out against his murderers, before the throne of the God of Sabbath, who will never fail to repay their wickedness upon their heads.”

Such was the spirit of the league, and of the monks in those days; and such the horrid abuse made of religion, which was so ill understood; an abuse which has continued even to our days.

It is not long since a Jesuit, named la Croix, who was professor of divinity at Cologne, reprinted, with notes, a book written by an old Jesuit named Bussembaum; and which would have remained as much unknown as the author and his commentator, if it had not unhappily served to revive the detestable doctrine of murder and regicide.

It is said in this work, that any person outlawed by a prince, cannot be lawfully put to death any where, but in the dominions of such prince; but that a crowned head, excommunicated by the pope, may be murdered wherever he is found, inasmuch as the pope is sovereign lord of the universe; and that any one having orders to slay an excommunicated person, be whom he will, may delegate his charge to another; and that it is an act of charity to accept of such charge.

It is true, that the parliaments of France have condemned this abominable work; and that the Jesuits of
that

that kingdom have publickly declared their abhorrence of the doctrine it contained; but, on the other hand, a new edition of this book, with additions, sufficiently shews that these infernal tenets have been long ingrafted in a number of minds; that they have been looked upon as points of our holy religion; and that consequently the laws cannot exert themselves with too much rigour against the teachers and abettors of regicide.

Henry IV. at length fell a sacrifice to this vile doctrine. Ravaillac had been for some time a monk of the order of Feuillants†, and his imagination was still heated with the notions he had imbibed in his youth. Never did superstition in any age produce such effects. This wretch believed, exactly like John Chatel, that he should appease the divine wrath by the murder of Henry IV. The common people had a notion that the king intended to wage war against the pope, because he was going to assist the protestants of Germany. The empire was divided into two leagues; one the evangelical, composed of all the protestant princes; the other the catholic, to which they had prefixed the pope's name. Henry IV. protected the protestant league; and this was the only cause of his assassination. We must give credit to the constant depositions of Ravaillac. He protested, without ever varying, that he had no accomplice; that he had been excited to commit this murder by an irresistible impulse. He signed his interrogatory, a few leaves of which were found in 1720 by one of the registers in parliament: I have had a sight of them; the abominable name is very well written; and underneath in the same hand-writing are these words, "Let Jesus be ever victorious in my heart;" a further proof that this monster was a fanatic. It is well known that the order of Feuillants, to which Ravaillac belonged, were still insatuated with the fanatic spirit of the leaguers, and that this infamous miscreant was abandoned to superstition, and all manner of vice. Counsellor Matthieu, historiographer of France, who

† An order of begging friars, instituted by St. Bernard. T. held

held a long conversation with him in the little hotel de Retz, near the Louvre, tells us, that this wretch had been for three years under a strong temptation to murder the king. A counsellor of parliament, asking him in the same hotel, and in the presence of Matthieu, how he had dared to lift his hand against the most christian king? "It is first to be known, replied he, if he was "most christian."

The irresistible force of destiny shews itself more plainly in this event, than in any other we read of. A schoolmaster from Angouleme, without forming any conspiracy, without having any accomplice, or being in the least interested in what he did, kills Henry IV. in the midst of his subjects, and changes the face of affairs in Europe.

The whole of the proceedings against him, which were printed in 1611, shews that this man had in fact no other accomplices than the sermons of the preachers of those times, and the discourse of the monks. He was a great bigot, much given to mental and extempore prayer, and pretended at times to have visions from heaven. He confessed, that after leaving the Feuillants, he had frequently a desire to take the Jesuit's habit. He likewise confessed that his first design was only to have persuaded the king to banish the reformed religion out of France; and that once in the Christmas holidays, seeing the king pass in his coach through the same streets, where he afterwards murdered him, he cried out, "Sire, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, "and the most holy Virgin Mary, I conjure you to let me speak to you;" but that the guards pushed him away from the coach; that then he returned back to Angouleme, his birth-place, where he kept a school, and had eighty scholars, and that during his stay there he frequently went to confession and took the sacrament: and it appeared, from many proofs, that he conceived his hellish designs in the midst of the most fanatic acts of devotion. His answer to the second interrogatory, in his examination, was in these words: "No one what-
"ever either counselled or assisted him in the perpetra-
"ting

“ing this deed; only that hearing the soldiers in general talking amongst themselves, that if the king was to make war against the pope, they would assist him, and lay down their lives for his cause; that therefore, and for that reason, he suffered himself to be led away by the strong desire he felt to kill the king, because, in his opinion, the making war against the pope, is making war against God, inasmuch as the pope is God, and God is the pope.” Thus we find every thing concur to prove to us that Henry IV. was in fact the victim of those horrible prejudices, which have so long blinded the understandings of mankind, and spread desolation over the face of the earth. There are those who have dared to impute this crime to the house of Austria, to Mary de Medicis the king’s wife, to Balzac d’Entragues his mistress, to the duke d’Epernon; conjectures most odious, which Mezeray and others have taken up without inquiry, but which destroy one another, and only serve to shew how credulous is human malignity.

It has been confidently asserted, that Henry’s approaching death was talked of in the Low Countries long before the fatal blow was given. It is not at all astonishing, that the partisans of the catholic league, seeing the formidable army he was on the point of leading into the field, might say that nothing but the death of Henry could save them. They and the rest of the leaguers undoubtedly wished for a second Clement, Gerard, or Chatel to arise. This hope would easily break forth into expressions, and these being waisted abroad, something of this kind might reach the ears of Ravallac, and determine him to put his bloody purpose in execution.

It is certain likewise, that it had been told to Henry that he should die in his coach. This notion arose from the great dread this prince, in other respects so intrepid, was always under of being overturned when in any wheel carriage. This natural weakness was looked upon by astrologers as an omen: and this notion of theirs, formed at random, was verified by the most improbable of all events.

Ravallac

Ravaillac was only the blind tool of the superstitious spirit of the times. Barriere, Chatel, Ouin the Carthusian, the vicar of St. Nicholas des Champs, hanged in 1595, the tapestry-maker in 1596, a wretch who was either really, or pretended to be, out of his senses, and others, whose names have escaped my memory, attempted the same crime; most of them young men, and of the dregs of the nation; so true it is that in young people of the lower class, religion degenerates into madness. Of all the assassins this shocking age produced, not one but Poltrot de Merè was a gentleman. I except those who murdered the duke of Guise, by order of Henry III. because they were not fanatics.

It is but too true that Henry IV. was neither known nor esteemed during his life-time. The same spirit which gave rise to so many attempts to assassinate him, constantly excited the catholic faction against him, and his necessary change of religion lost him the esteem of the protestants. His wife, who did not love him, loaded him with domestic uneasiness. Even his mistress, the marchioness d'Entragues conspired against him, and the bitterest satire against his probity and manners, was the work of his near relation the princess of Conti. In a word, it was not till after his being assassinated that he became dear to the nation. The inconsiderate, tumultuous and unfortunate administration of his widow, added to the regret which the loss of her husband had occasioned. The Memoirs of the duke of Sully, displayed his many amiable qualities, and made his failings appear excusable. The more the history of his reign was studied, the more his memory was revered. The age of Louis XIV. was doubtless much greater than his, but Henry IV. is universally esteemed a much greater man than Louis XIV. In short, his glory seems to be every day increasing, so that the esteem in which his memory is held by the French nation, has risen to a degree of enthusiasm. We have lately seen a singular proof of this at St. Denis, when a funeral oration was pronounced there by a bishop of Puy en Velay, in honour of the late queen of France, wife to Louis XV.

In this discourse, the orator not having been able to fix the attention of his hearers, although the subject of it was an amiable princess, more than fifty persons detached themselves from the rest of the audience, in order to visit the tomb of Henry IV. where they threw themselves upon their knees around his coffin, and by their sighs and tears testified their love for his memory. Never was there a finer apotheosis.

BY way of supplement to this chapter of Henry IV. I shall add the following letters, written by that prince to Corisada d'Andouin, widow of Philibert count of Grammont. They are all of them without date; but it will easily appear by the notes at what time they were written. Some of them are extremely interesting, and the name of Henry IV. is sufficient to make every one of them valuable.

L E T T E R I.

THERE is hardly a lackey escapes without having his bags taken from him, or his letters opened. Seven or eight gentlemen are arrived of those who were in the opposite army, and who affirm as a truth (and of them is M. de Monlouet, brother to Rambouillet, who was one of the deputies) that there are not ten gentlemen who have engaged to bear arms. M. de Bouillon has not engaged himself. He has lost nothing that could be discovered for money. M. de Mayenne has committed an action for which he will be far from being praised; he has killed Sacremore (who asked for a recompence for his services) by stabbing him with a poniard. I am told that not being willing to satisfy him, he feared that being discontented, he might betray his secrets, as he was acquainted with every thing, even with his enterprize against the king, in which he had a principal share *. God seems inclined to destroy them with their

* Nothing can be more curious than this anecdote: the proper name of this Sacremore was Birague. This transaction proves the

own weapons; for he was the most useful servant they had. They buried him before he was quite dead. I have gotten this intelligence from Morlas, and one of my cousin's servants, who were plundered of their letters and cloaths. M. de Turenne will be here to-morrow. In three days time he has taken eighteen forts near Fizac. If it please God, I shall hope to do something better than this soon. The report of my death has spread to Hay and Meaux, and even to Paris, and some preachers in their sermons considered it as a piece of good luck that God had sent them. Adieu, my life, I kiss your hands a million of times.

Jan. 14.

L E T T E R II.†

THERE has happened one of the greatest misfortunes that I could possibly fear, which is the death of the prince. I lament him as what he might have been to me, not as what he was. At this present hour, I am the only object the perfidious wretches who go to mass have in view. These traitors poisoned him‡; I hope that God will punish them for so doing, and that I, through his grace, shall be the means. This poor prince (not in heart) having run at the ring on Thursday, supped in good health, and at midnight was seized with a vomiting which lasted till morning. All Friday he stayed in bed, at night supped, and having slept well got up on Saturday morning, dined up, and afterwards played at chess. He got up from his chair, walked about his chamber, talking with one and the other; all of a sudden he said, "Bring me my chair, "I feel a great weakness." He was no sooner seated, than he lost his speech, and soon afterwards gave up

the duke of Mayenne to have been of a much more vicious and cruel disposition than historians have described him; nor is this extraordinary in the leader of a party. This letter was written in 1587. V.

† March, 1558. V.

‡ See Letter III. V.

the ghost while sitting. The marks of the poison soon appeared. It is hardly credible the surprize this has occasioned in that country. I shall set out at day break to see after this affair with all diligence. I see I am likely to have a great deal of trouble in it. Pray well to God for me; if I escape it will be him that protects me, and perhaps I am nearer to him than I think. I remain your faithful slave. Good night, my life, I kiss your hands a million of times.

L E T T E R III. *

TWO couriers from St. John reached me yesterday; one at noon and the other at night. The first informed us, that Belcassel, the princess's page, and her valet de chambre, had fled on a sudden, after they believed their master to be dead. They had found, at an inn in the suburbs, two horses, each of two hundred crowns value, which had been kept there fifteen days, and they had each a bag full of money. Inquiry being made of the host, he said that one named Brillant †, who had brought the horses to him, had been with him every day to see that they were taken good care of, and had ordered him to give eight measures of corn every day to these horses, instead of four which he gave to the other horses, and that he would pay double. This Brillant ‡, is a man whom the princess took into her family, and gave him the management of every thing. He was soon taken, and confessed he had given a thousand crowns to the page, and to have purchased horses for him, by his mistress's order, to carry him into Italy. The second courier confirms all this, and says farther,

* This letter was written in March, 1558. V.

† Brillant, comptroller of the household to the prince of Condé, is improperly called Brillaud by historical writers. V.

‡ He was quartered at St. John d'Angeli by order of the provost, and by the same magistrate, the princess of Condé was condemned to be imprisoned till after her lying-in. She was delivered in August of Henry of Condé, first prince of the blood. She appealed to the court of peers, but remained prisoner at Angeli till the year 1596, when Henry IV. suppressed the proceedings. V.

they

they had made this Brillant write to the valet de chambre, who was known to be at Poitiers, telling him in his letter that he was only two hundred yards from the gate of the town and wanted to speak to him. The other came out of the town immediately, and the people who were there in waiting for him, took him and carried him to St. John. When these couriers came away he had not been examined, but he said to the people in his way, "The princess is a wicked woman, let her tailor be secured; I will tell every thing," which thing was accordingly done.—This is all that has been done hitherto.—I am seldom wrong in my opinions, and I think a bad woman is a dangerous animal. All these poisoners are papists.—I have discovered an assassin for myself*. God will preserve me from him, and I will soon tell you more about him. The governor and officers of Taillebourg have sent two soldiers to me, and write word that they will deliver up the place only to me, of which I am very glad. They are sorely pressed by the enemy, and they are so desirous to clear up this affair, that they give them no hindrance. They suffer no person to leave St. John, but those who are sent to me. M. de la Trimouille is there. They tell me that if I delay much, there may be much and great mischief; this makes me hasten, so that I shall take a score of persons with me and shall travel night and day, that I may be back again at St. Foi to the assembly. My life, I am pretty well in body, but sorely afflicted in mind; continue to love me and this will be a great consolation to me. As for my part, I shall not be wanting in the fidelity I have vowed to you; in truth of which I kiss your hands a million of times.

Daymet, March 13.

* It was at Nerac that an assassin was discovered, who was a native of Lorraine, and had been sent thither by the priests of the league. There were more than fifty attempts against the life of this great and good prince, *Tantum religio potuit suadere morum!* V.

LET-

L E T T E R IV.

I REACHED Pons last night, where I had news from St. John, from whence suspicions increase on every side. I shall see every thing to-morrow. I dread greatly the sight of the faithful servants of the family, for in truth this is the most mournful scene that was ever seen. The popish preachers in all the towns hereabouts, declare openly that there is only one thing more to do, and canonize this fine action and those who have committed it, exhorting all good catholics to take example from this Christian enterprize; and you are of this religion! indeed, my life, this is a fine subject to exercise your piety and virtue; don't hesitate to throw this monk's frock to the nettles, for I tell you the truth. The disputes between M. d'Epernon and the marshal d'Aumont and Grillon, disturb the court greatly. I shall have news from thence daily, and will let you know what passes. The man, Briquesiere spoke to you about, has played some idle tricks, which I came to the knowledge of about two days ago. I must finish here, as I am just going to get on horseback. I kiss your hands a million of times my dear mistress.

March 17.

L E T T E R V.

GOD knows the regret I feel at being obliged to leave this place without coming to kiss your hands. Indeed my life I am grieved at it. You will be surprized (and will say that I have not been deceived) at what Liceran will tell you. The devil is let loose, I am to be pitied, and it will be a miracle if I escape. If I was not a Huguenot, I would turn Turk. My brain is surely put to violent trials, and I must soon be either an idiot or a clever fellow. This year will be my touchstone. This domestic uneasiness is the most painful of any. All the plagues that can possibly torment the mind, are incessantly employed upon mine. I say all together—

together—pity me, my life, and be careful not to add to my uneasiness. This would be the most insupportable. I shall set out on Friday, and go to Clerac. I shall follow your advice and hold my tongue. Believe me, nothing but a want of friendship can make me change the resolution I have taken to be eternally yours. Continue to love me, for your kindness is my only support in the midst of this affliction, therefore do not withdraw it. Good night, my life, I kiss your feet a million of times.

Neroe, March 8th, at midnight.

L E T T E R VI.

AM I never to write to you but about the taking of towns and forts? In eight days I am become master of St. Mexant and Maille, and you may hope to hear something of me before the end of this month*. The king triumphs. He has caused the cardinal de Guise to be bound with cords in prison; and the president de Neuilly, the provost of the merchants, the duke of Guise's secretary and three others to be hung. The queen his mother said to him; "Grant me one request that I shall make to you," "According as what it may be," "madam," replied the prince. "It is that you would give me M. de Nemours and the prince of Guise; they are young, and may one day be of use to you."

* This letter must have been written three or four days after the murder of the duke of Guise; but he was deceived with respect to the pretended execution of the president de Neuilly and M. de la Chapelle Marteau. Henry III. confined them in prison; they deserved to be put to death, but were not. We must not always believe what is written by kings; they are often told what is not true. This mistake was probably corrected in some other letter which is not extant. This Neuilly and this Marteau were most violent leaguers, who had assassinated a great number of catholics and protestants, of the king's party, on St. Bartholomew's day. Rose, bishop of Senlis, who was likewise a furious leaguer, seduced Neuilly's daughter, and had a child by her. There never was a greater scene of cruelty and debauchery than at that time. V.

"I grant

"I grant you this madam, said he, you shall have their persons, but I shall keep their papers." He has sent to Lyons, in order to catch the duke of Mayenne, and it is not known yet whether he has succeeded or not. They are fighting at Orleans, and still nearer at Poitiers, I shall be within seven leagues of the latter to-morrow. If the king was willing, I could set things right. I pity you, if the weather with you is as it is here, where it has not thawed for these ten days. I wait only to hear of their sending to strangle the queen of Navarre †, and this, with the death of my mother, would make me sing the song of Simeon. This letter is too long for a soldier. Good night my life. I embrace you a thousand times. Love me as you have a right to do. This is new-year's day; poor Caramburu has lost the fight of one eye, and Florimont is at the point of death.

L E T T E R VII.

MY life, I write to you from Blois ‡, where, five months ago only, I was condemned as a heretic, and as one unworthy to succeed to the crown, whereas, I am now its principal support. Mark the goodness of God towards those who put their trust in him; for there was nothing which, in appearance, had so much weight as a decree of the states; yet I appealed to him who has all things at his disposal, (as many others have done,) and he has been pleased to revise the proceedings, to annul the decrees of men, and to restore to me my right; and I trust that this will be at the expence of my enemies, and so much the better for you. They who trust in God, are preserved by him and never confused. This is what you ought well to think on. I am in good health, thank God, and can swear to you with truth,

† It is his wife he alludes to here; she was connected with the Guises, and queen Catharine, his mother, was at that time sick and at the point of death. V.

‡ This must have been written about the end of April, 1589. He was then at Blois with Henry III. V.

that I neither love nor honour any one in the world as I do you. I shall preserve this fidelity to the grave. I am going to Boisjeancy, where I believe you will soon hear me spoken of, and indeed, I have no doubt of it. I shall contrive things so, as to have my sister with me soon, and I beg you will determine to come with her. The king has spoken to me about the lady d'Auvergne. Good-day, my life, I embrace you a million of times, and am bound to you by an indissoluble tie.

May 18.

L E T T E R VIII.

THE bearer will inform you of the success God has given us, after the most bloody battle we have had in this war*. He will inform you likewise how Messieurs de Longueville, de la Noue, and others have triumphed near Paris. If the king is as active, as I hope he will be, we shall soon see the spire of Notre dame at Paris. I wrote to you only two days ago by Petit-Jean. God grant that this week we may signalize ourselves as much as we did the last. My life, continue to love me as yourself, for I esteem you as mine. In truth of which, I kiss your hands. Adieu my life.

Boisjeancy, May 20.

L E T T E R IX.

SEND Briquiere to me and he shall return to you with all that you want. I am much grieved and afflicted at the loss of my young one, who died yesterday†; you will say, what would it have been if he had been legitimate. He was just beginning to speak. I know not why you have written for Doisil; let me know your pleasure. The enemy are before Montegu, where they will be well soaked, for the country is overflowed for half

* This battle was fought on the 18th of May, 1589. The count de Chatillon defeated the leaguers with great slaughter. V.

† This was a son he had had by the countess of Grammont. V.

a league round. The assembly will break up in twelve days. I had yesterday a great deal of news from Blois; I send you an extract of what is most to be depended upon. A man is this moment come to me from Montegu, who tells me they have made a fine sally, and killed a great number of the enemy. I have ordered all my troops, and I hope, if the place should hold out only for fifteen days, to be able to do some good things. What I said to you about doing harm to no one, was meant for your content as well as my own. I speak to you now, as though you were mine. Indeed, my life, I have a strange desire to see you. There is a man here, who is charged with letters for my sister, from the king of Scotland. He presses her more than ever to marry him; he offers to send me six thousand men at his own expence*, and even to come and offer his service in person. He will infallibly be king of England. Prevail upon my sister to be favourable to him; point out to her the condition we are in, the grandeur of this prince, and his good qualities. I shall not write to her about it. Speak to her in the way of discourse; tell her it is time for her to marry? that this is the only chance for her, for as to our relations, the case is melancholy. Adieu, my life, I embrace you a million of times.

December, 10.

* This is a singular anecdote, which had escaped all the historians; it implies that he would one day be king of England, because queen Elizabeth had no children. This was the same king whom Henry IV. afterwards stiled *master James*. This letter must have been written in 1588. V.

CHAP.

C H A P. CLXXV.

Of France under Louis XIII. till the Administration of Cardinal Richelieu.—States General held in France.—Unfortunate Administration.—The Marshal d'Ancre assassinated, and his Wife condemned to be burnt.—Administration of the Duke de Luines.—Civil Wars.—In what Manner Cardinal Richelieu was admitted into the Council.

IT appeared, after the death of Henry IV. how much the power, the respect, the manners, and spirit of a nation depend oftentimes on one man. The mild, yet steady administration of this prince, had kept all the different orders of the realm united, all factions lulled to sleep, the two religions in peace, and plenty among the people. By his alliances, his treasures, and his arms, he held the balance of Europe in his own hands. All those advantages were lost in the very first year of the regency of his widow Mary de Medicis. The duke d'Epemon, that proud minion of Henry III. in private an enemy to Henry IV. in public to his ministers, repaired to the parliament the very day the king was murdered. D'Epemon was colonel-general of ⁱⁿ May infantry; and had the command of the regiment of ¹⁴ guards: entering the assembly, he laid hold of the hilt of his sword, and obliged the parliament to assume the right of disposing of the regency, a right which had hitherto belonged only to the states-general. The laws of all nations have determined, that they who nominate to the throne, when vacant, should appoint a regency. To make a king is the first of rights; to appoint a regent is the second, and supposeth the first. The parliament of Paris adjudged the cause of the throne, as arbiters of the supreme power, because they were menaced by the duke d'Epemon, and there was not time sufficient to assemble the three orders of the kingdom.

They decreed Mary de Medicis sole regent. The queen went the next day to get this decree confirmed in her son's presence; and the chancellor de Sillery, at

the *bed of justice* *, took the votes of the presidents, before those of the peers, and even of the princes of the blood, who pretended to share the regency.

Hence it appears, and we have often observed it, in what manner rights and usages are established, how that which has been solemnly transacted, contrary to ancient practice, becomes a precedent hereafter, till some new occasion abolishes it.

Mary de Medicis, regent, but not mistress of the kingdom, willing to raise a number of dependants, squandered away all the money, that Henry the Great had amassed, with a view of extending the power and influence of his kingdom. The troops which he was going to head, were for the most part disbanded; and 1610 the princes whom he supported, were forsaken. Charles Emanuel, duke of Savoy, the new ally of Henry IV. was obliged to beg pardon of Philip III. king of Spain, for having concluded a treaty with the king of France; he sent his son to Madrid to implore mercy of that court, and to humble himself like a subject in his father's name. The princes of Germany, whom Henry had protected with an army of forty thousand men, were now but feebly assisted. The kingdom lost all its weight abroad, and was disturbed at home. The princes of the blood and the great lords divided the country into factions, just as in the times of Francis II. of Charles IX. of Henry III. and afterwards in the minority of Louis XIV.

1614 At length the last assembly of the states-general was held at Paris. The parliament of Paris could not have a seat there. Their deputies had assisted at the great assembly of the chief men of the kingdom, held at Rouen, in 1594: but that was not an assembly of the states-general; the intendants of the revenue and the treasurers had sat there as well as the magistrates.

The university of Paris sent a formal summons to the ecclesiastical chamber, to admit her as a member of the

* *Le lit de justice*, or *bed of justice*, is when the king himself is present in parliament. T.

states; this she said was her ancient privilege: but she had lost her privileges, together with her weight, in proportion as people grew more subtle, though not more knowing. Those tumultuary assemblies had not the deposit of the laws and customs like the British parliament, or the diet of the empire: they constituted no part of the legislature; yet they would fain be legislators: this is a power to which the representative body of a nation ever aspires, because a general ambition ariseth from the secret views of each individual.

What was more remarkable in this assembly, the clergy in vain demanded that the council of Trent should be received in France; and the third estate likewise in vain insisted on establishing the following law, "That no temporal or spiritual power has a right to dispose of the kingdom, or to release the subjects from their oath of allegiance; and that the opinion which makes it lawful to take away the lives of kings, is impious and detestable."

And yet this third estate of Paris, that demanded this law, was the very same that had attempted to depose Henry III. and that afterwards had chosen to suffer rather the extremity of famine, than to acknowledge Henry IV. But the faction of the league was extinguished; and the third estate being composed of the body of the people, who can be warped by no private interest, loved the throne, and detested the pretensions of the court of Rome. On this occasion, cardinal du Perron forgot what he owed to the family of Henry IV. and thought of nothing but the church. He made a strong opposition to the law above-mentioned, and went so far as to say, "That he should be obliged to excommunicate those, who would be so obstinate, as to maintain that the church has not a deposing power." He further added, "That the popes had full and superabundant authority over princes, directly in spirituals, and indirectly in temporals." The ecclesiastical chamber, being governed by cardinal du Perron, persuaded the chamber of the nobility to join with them. The body of the nobles had been ever jealous of the clergy; yet they

they affected to think differently from the third estate. The question was, whether *the spiritual and temporal powers* could dispose of the crown. The body of the nobles looked upon themselves in the main, and without saying it, as a temporal power. The cardinal told them, "That if a king wanted to compel his subjects to be—
"come Arians or Mahometans, he ought to be deposed." Such a speech was very unreasonable; for there have been a great many Arian emperors and kings, and yet none were deposed on that account. This supposition, chimerical as it was, persuaded the deputies of the nobility, that there were particular cases in which the chief men of the nation might dethrone their sovereign; and this power, how distant soever, was so flattering to human vanity, that the nobles would fain share it with the clergy. The ecclesiastical chamber declared to the third estate, that indeed it was never lawful to kill the king; but they continued resolute as to every thing else.

In the midst of this strange dispute, the parliament issued a decree, "Declaring the absolute independence
"of the throne to be a fundamental law of the kingdom."

Doubtless it was the interest of the court to support the demand of the third estate, and the decree of parliament, after so many disturbances which had endangered the throne under the preceding reigns. Yet they gave way to cardinal du Perron, to the clergy, and especially to Rome, with which they were willing to keep fair: they smothered an opinion on which the security of the crown is founded, because they fancied it would never be combated by overt-acts, and they were willing to put an end to disputes already grown too delicate and odious. They even suppressed the decree of parliament, under pretence that this court had no right to determine matters of state, that they had not shewn due respect to the crown, and that it was not their business to enact fundamental laws. Thus the government rejected the assistance of those who had taken up arms in their cause, presuming they should

never

never want them; in a word, the result of this assembly was to take notice of the several abuses of the kingdom, without being able to reform any.

France continued in confusion, under the administration of Florentine Concini, who was made marshal of France without having ever drawn a sword, and first minister without knowing the laws of the kingdom. His being a foreigner was reason enough for the princes to find fault with him.

Mary de Medicis was very unfortunate; for she could neither share her authority with the prince of Condé, the chief of the malecontents, without intirely losing it; nor trust Concini with it, without disoblising the whole kingdom. Henry, prince of Condé, father of the great Condé, and son of him who had gained the battle of Coutras along with Henry IV. put himself at the head of a party, and took up arms. The court concluded a sham peace with him, and sent him to the Bastille.

This had been the fate of his father and grand-father, 1616 as it was afterwards of his son. His imprisonment increased the number of malecontents. The Guises, who had been heretofore the implacable enemies of the Condés, joined with them upon this occasion. The duke de Vendome, son of Henry IV; the duke de Nevers, of the house of Gonzaga; the marshal de Bouillon; in a word, all the discontented lords begin to strengthen themselves in their several provinces, protesting that they were serving their king, and had no intention to wage war against any body but the prime minister.

The marshal d'Ancre, for so Concini was stiled, being secure of the queen's protection, set them all at defiance. He raised seven thousand men at his own expence, in order to maintain the royal, or rather his own, authority; and this was what ruined him. It is true he raised those troops under the king's commission; but it was one of the great grievances of the state, that a foreigner, who came to France without any fortune, should have wherewithal to muster up as strong an army, as those with which Henry IV. had reconquered his

his kingdom. Almost the whole nation was against him, but could not pull him down: yet a young man, of whom he had no mistrust, and who was a foreigner like himself, proved the cause of his ruin, and of all the misfortunes of Mary de Medicis.

Charles Albert de Luines, a native of the county of Avignon, having been admitted with his two brothers among the gentlemen in ordinary that had the government of the young king, introduced himself into the familiarity of that prince, by his dexterity in bird catching. Little was it expected that those innocent amusements would terminate in a bloody revolution. The marshal d'Ancre had obtained the government of Amboise for de Luines, thinking by that means to secure him in his interest: but the ungrateful young man formed a design of murdering his benefactor, of banishing the queen, and of governing the king; all which he easily compassed. He soon persuaded his majesty, that he was capable of taking the reins of government into his own hands, though he was only sixteen years and a half old; telling him that the queen his mother and Concini kept him in leading strings. The young king, who had been entitled the *Just* even from his infancy, consented to the murder of his prime minister.

- 1617 The marquis de Vitri, captain of the guards, his brother du Hallier, Persan, and some others, fired at him with their pistols, and killed him in the very palace of the Louvre. The murderers cried out, *Long live the king*, as if they had won a battle. Louis XIII. put his head out of the window, and said, *Now I am king*. The queen-mother's guards were removed, and disarmed; she herself was confined to her apartment, and at length exiled to Blois. The post of marshal of France, which Concini had enjoyed, was bestowed upon Vitri his murderer. The queen had given the same reward to Thémynes, for arresting the prince of Condé: this made the marshal duke de Bouillon say, "That he was ashamed to be a marshal of France, since this dignity was the recompence of a bailiff, and of an assassin."

The

The populace, who are generally in extremes, and ever barbarous when the reins of government are slackened, went and pulled the dead carcase of Concini, which had been buried at S. Germain L'Auxerrois, out of the ground, and dragged it through the streets: they plucked out his heart, when some of them were so brutal as to broil it publicly on a coal fire, and to eat it; after which they hung his body upon a gibbet. There was still a spirit of ferocity in the nation, which the flourishing days of Henry IV. and the polite arts introduced by Mary de Medicis, had somewhat softened: but it would break out again on the least occasion. The bloody remains of the marshal d'Ancre were treated thus by the populace, only because he was a foreigner, and had been invested with power.

The History of the celebrated Nani, the Memoirs of the marshal d'Etrees, and of the count de Brienne, do justice to Concini's merit, and to his innocence. These authorities contribute to instruct the living, though they can be of no service to such as have been put to a cruel and unjust death.

This transport of hatred was not confined to the people: a commission was sent to the parliament to condemn the marshal after his decease, to bring his wife Eleanor Galigai to her trial, and to cover the infamy of an assassination with the cruelty of juridical forms. Five counsellors of the parliament refused to be present at this sentence; but this shews that there were only five resolute and conscientious members of that body.

Never was any proceeding more repugnant to equity, or more shocking to good sense. There was nothing to lay to the charge of the marshal's lady; she had been the queen's favourite, and that was all her crime. They accused her of witchcraft; and the *agnus Dei's* †, she had about her, were taken for *talismans*. Courtin, one of the judges, asked her, what charm she had made use

† These are pieces of wax, which after being blessed by the pope, are stamped with the figure of a lamb holding a cross. T.

of to bewitch the queen? Galigai full of indignation against the judge, and somewhat dissatisfied with Mary de Medicis, made answer: "My witchcraft was the superiority, which people of sense have over weak minds." This answer did not save her; some of the judges had understanding and justice enough to condemn her to death; but the rest hurried away by public prejudice, by ignorance, and still more by those who were impatient to get the spoils of those unfortunate persons, 1617 passed sentence at the same time on the husband already deceased, and on the wife, as being convicted of sorcery, of judaism, and of misdemeanors. The marshal's lady was burnt, and Luines, the king's favourite, had the confiscated estate.

It was this unfortunate Galigai who was the first promoter of cardinal Richelieu, when he was yet a young man, and known by the name of the abbé du Chillon: she obtained the bishopric of Luçon for him, and the post of secretary of state in 1616. He was involved in the disgrace of his patrons; and he who afterwards issued sentence of exile on such numbers from the throne, where he sat near his royal master, was banished to a little priory in a corner of Anjou.

Concini, without having served in the army, had been marshal of France; and Luines, though scarce an officer, was four years afterwards made constable. Such an administration created contempt; the grandees and the people fell into factions, and there is nothing they did not dare to undertake.

The duke d'Epemon who had been the cause of conferring the regency on the queen, released her from 1619 the castle of Blois to which she had been banished; and conducted her to his estate at Angouleme, like a sovereign assisting his ally.

This was certainly a treasonable act, yet an act applauded by the whole kingdom, and that covered the duke d'Epemon with glory. Mary de Medicis had been hated in her prosperity; but now she was beloved in her adversity. Not one man in the kingdom had made

made the least complaint, when Louis XIII. imprisoned his mother in the Louvre, and afterwards banished her without a cause; and now attempting to recover her from out of the hands of a rebel, was treated as a flagitious deed. Such apprehensions had the public of the violent counsels of de Luines, and of the cruelty and weakness of the king, that his own confessor, Arnoux the Jesuit, preaching in his presence before the reconciliation, spoke these remarkable words: "It is not to
" be supposed that a religious prince would draw his
" sword, to spill the very blood from whence he was
" formed: you will not permit me, sire, to assert a
" lye from the seat of truth, I conjure you, by the
" bowels of Christ, not to listen to violent counsels,
" nor to give this scandal to all the Christian princes
" in Europe."

It is a further proof of the weakness of the government, that any man durst to speak thus from the pulpit. Father Arnoux could not have expressed himself in stronger terms, even if the king had condemned his mother to death. At that time Louis XIII. had hardly an army to oppose the duke d'Epernon. This was preaching publicly against the government; it was speaking on the behalf of God against the duke de Luines. Either this confessor must have been possessed of an heroic though indiscreet freedom; or he must have been bribed by Mary de Medicis. Whatever might be his motive, this public discourse proves that there was a noble boldness at that time, even in men who seemed framed only for soft compliance. The constable some years after made the king send away his confessor.

The king however, far from going those violent lengths which were apprehended, courted his mother, and treated with the duke d'Epernon, as with a crowned head. He had not even the courage to say in his declaration, that d'Epernon had offended him.

No sooner had the treaty of reconciliation been signed, but it was broke; this was the spirit of the times.

New partisans of the queen-mother were up in arms; their complaints were always against the duke de Luines, as before against the marshal d'Ancre, but never against the king. Every favorite in those days proved the source of a civil war. Louis XIII. and his mother did really wage war against each other. Mary de Medicis was in Anjou at the head of a small army to oppose her son; a battle was fought at the bridge of Cé; and the state was upon the point of being ruined.

1620 This confusion made the celebrated Richelieu's fortune. He was steward of the queen-mother's household, and had supplanted all the favourites of that princess, as he afterwards supplanted all the king's ministers. His pliant temper and enterprising genius must have raised him to the highest post, or destroyed him. He conducted the reconciliation betwixt the mother and son. His elevation to the cardinalate, which the queen demanded and obtained with some difficulty for him, was the recompence of this piece of service. The duke d'Epemon was the first to lay down his arms, but asked nothing: all the rest made the king pay them for having carried on a war against him.

The queen and the king her son had an interview at Brissac: they embraced each other with tears, but quarrelled afterwards more than ever. Such weakness, such intrigues and divisions at court, could not fail to introduce anarchy into the kingdom. All the internal vices which had been long undermining the state, were increased; and those which Henry IV. had extirpated, were revived.

The church suffered greatly, and was fallen into excessive irregularities. It was not the interest of Henry IV. to reform them: the ill-judged devotion of Louis XIII. permitted the disorder to continue: order and decency were not introduced till the reign of Louis XIV. Almost all the incumbents were laymen, who allowed a salary to poor priests to officiate on their livings. All the princes of the blood were possessed of rich abbeys. A great many benefices were considered as family estates. It was usual to settle an abbey in portion for a daughter; and

and for a colonel to recruit his regiment with the revenue of a priory. The court clergy oftentimes wore a sword: and amongst the duels or private combats which depopulated France, they reckoned several in which the clergy were concerned, from the cardinal de Guise, who drew his sword against the duke of Nevers Gonzaga in 1617, down to the abbé and afterwards cardinal de Retz, who fought a great many duels while he was soliciting the archbishoprick of Paris.

The minds of the people in general were still rude and uncultivated. The genius of the Malherbes and the Racans was only a dawn of light, which did not diffuse itself over the nation. A rustic pedantry, companion of that ignorance which passed in those days for science, soured the manners of the societies appointed for the instruction of youth, and even of the magistrates. It hardly seems credible in these days, that the parliament of Paris, in 1621, issued a decree prohibiting every body upon pain of death, to teach any opinion contrary to Aristotle or the ancient authors; and that a person named de Clave, and his associates, were banished from Paris, for having attempted to maintain theses concerning the number of elements, and matter and form, contrary to the principles of Aristotle.

Notwithstanding this severity of manners, and these prohibitions, the administration of justice was venal in most of the provincial courts of judicature. Henry IV. had acknowledged it to the parliament of Paris, who had ever distinguished themselves as much by their uncorrupt integrity, as by a spirit of opposition to ministerial pleasure, and pecuniary edicts. "I know, said he to them; that you do not sell the administration of justice, but in other parliaments a person must frequently maintain his right by dint of money: I remember it, and I have often put my hand into my purse myself."

The nobility either retiring to their strong holds, or mounting on horseback to serve the governor of a province, or enlisting themselves under princes who disturbed the state, oppressed the husbandman. The towns
were

were without police, the roads impracticable, and infested with robbers. The records of parliament make it appear, that the patrol, for the security of Paris, at that time consisted only of five and forty men, who did no duty. These irregularities which Henry IV. could not reform, were not of the nature of those disorders that tend to destroy the body politic: the disorders really dangerous were the bad management of the revenue, the squandering of the treasure amassed by Henry IV. the necessity of laying duties upon the people, in times of peace, which Henry had declined, when he was at the eve of a war of the utmost importance; the tyrannical method of raising those duties, which enriched none but the farmers of the revenue; the odious estates of those farmers, whom the duke of Sully had banished from court, but who under the succeeding administrations grew fat with the blood of the people.

To those internal disorders under which the body politic languished, were added some others, by which it was often thrown into violent convulsions. The governors of the provinces, who were only lieutenants to Henry IV. would fain be independent of Louis XIII. Their rights, or usurpations were immense: they had the bestowing of all places; hence the poorer gentry stuck close to them, and hardly minded the king, much less the state. Every governor fleeced his province of as much, as was sufficient to maintain a body of troops, instead of the guard, which Henry IV. had taken from them. The province of Guienne was worth a million of livres to the duke d'Epemon; a sum equal to two millions of our present money, and even almost to four millions, if we consider the increased price of every commodity.

We have lately seen this subject protecting the queen-mother, waging war against the king, and accepting of peace with the air of a sovereign. The marshal de Lesdiguières had distinguished his own greatness, and the weakness of the throne, three years before, in 1616, after a more glorious manner. He raised an army of

regular troops at his own expence, or rather at the expence of Dauphiny, a province of which he was not so much as governor, but only lieutenant-general; he marched this army over the Alps, notwithstanding the repeated prohibitions of the court; he assisted the duke of Savoy, whom France had abandoned, against the Spaniards; and he returned in triumph to his own country. France at that period, as in the reign of Henry III. had a multitude of great lords who contributed only to weaken the monarchy.

It is not at all surprizing, that France should at that time have missed the fairest opportunity that had offered since the reign of Charles V. of limiting the power of the house of Austria, by assisting the elector Palatine, chosen king of Bohemia, and supporting the balance of Germany according to the plan laid down by Henry IV. and afterwards followed by the cardinals Richelieu and Mazarine. The court had conceived too great a jealousy of the French protestants, to protect those of Germany. The ministry were afraid lest the Huguenots should act the same part in France, as the Lutherans had done in the empire. But had the government been as well settled and as powerful as it was under Henry IV. or at the latter end of Richelieu's administration, or under Louis XIV. they might have assisted the protestants of Germany, and kept those of France in subjection. De Luines had no such extensive plan; and could he even have formed it, there was no possibility of his carrying it into execution: it required a perfect submission to authority, finances in good order, and numerous armies; all which were wanting.

The divisions at court under a sovereign, who would fain be absolute over his people, while he himself was governed by a minister, had diffused a spirit of sedition, through all the towns in the kingdom. This combustion could not fail sooner or later to communicate itself to the Calvinists of France. This the court were afraid of; and their fear was owing to their weak situation; they were sensible that their commands would be disobeyed; and yet they would command.

At

1620 At that time Louis XIII. was uniting the country of Bearn to the crown by a solemn edict: the catholics were restored to the possession of the churches, which the Huguenots had seized before the reign of Henry IV. and which had been relinquished to them by that monarch. These people assembled together at Rochelle in contempt of the king's prohibition. The love of liberty so natural to mankind, had inspired them with republican ideas; they had before their eyes the example of the protestants of Germany, and their imaginations were grown warm. They had divided the French provinces, where they were most numerous, into ten circles: each circle had a general as in Germany: and among those generals were the marshal de Bouillon, the duke of Soubise, the duke la Trimouille, Chatillon grandson of the admiral Coligni, and the marshal de Lesdiguières. The general commander whom they were to chuse in case of war, was to have a seal with these words engraved, *for Christ and for the king*, that is, against the king. Rochelle was then considered as the capital of this republic, which might be able to form a separate state within the kingdom.

From this very time, the protestants were preparing for war. It is plain they were powerful, since they offered the post of generalissimo to marshal de Lesdiguières, with an appointment of a hundred thousand crowns a month. Lesdiguières ambitious of being constable of France, chose rather to fight against them, than to command their army, and soon after he deserted their religion: but he found himself disappointed of his expectations at court. The duke de Luines, who had never drawn a sword, took the post of constable to himself; and Lesdiguières being too far engaged, was obliged to serve under de Luines against the reformed, though he had been hitherto their chief support.

The court was under a necessity of negotiating with all the leading men of the party, in order to keep them within bounds; and with all the governors of the provinces, to make them furnish troops. Louis XIII. marched towards the Loire into Poitou, to Bearn, and

to the southern provinces; the prince of Condé put himself at the head of a body of troops; and the constable de Luines commanded the royal army.

At that time they revived an ancient formality which is now intirely abolished. When they drew near to a town, where a suspected person commanded, a herald presented himself before the gate; the governor listened to him with his head uncovered, and the herald cried out, "To thee, Isaac, or Jacob such an one; the king, thy sovereign lord and mine, commands thee to open the gates to him, and to receive, as thou art in duty bound, both him and his army: in failure whereof, I declare thee guilty of high treason, and degraded of thy nobility, thee and thy posterity; thy goods shall be confiscated, thy houses, and those of thy accomplices, levelled to the ground."

Almost all the towns opened their gates to the king, except St. John d'Angeli, the fortifications of which he demolished; and the little town of Clerac, which surrendered at discretion. The court elated with this success, ordered the consul of Clerac and four of its ministers to be hanged.

This execution, instead of intimidating, only irritated 1621 the protestants. Pressed on every side, and deserted by the marshals de Lésdiguières and de Bouillon, they chose for their general the celebrated Benjamin duke of Rohan, who was looked upon as one of the greatest captains of his age, comparable to the princes of Orange, as capable as they of founding a republic, more zealous, at least in appearance, than they for his religion, a man vigilant, and indefatigable, allowing himself no pleasures to divert him from business, and formed by nature to be the head of a party; a post ever dangerous, where both friends and enemies are to be suspected. This title and rank of a party leader, had been long the study and aim of the ambitious throughout all Europe. The Guelphs and the Gibelines began in Italy. The Guises and the Colignis established afterwards a political school of this kind in France, which

was continued till Louis XIV. began to hold the reins of government.

Louis XIII. saw himself reduced to the necessity of besieging his own towns. The constable de Luines thought he should succeed before Montauban, as he
1621 had done before Clerac; but he lost very near his whole army, though his royal master commanded there in person.

Montauban was a place that would not hold out a siege of four days in our time; and so unskilfully was it invested, that the duke of Rohan flung succours into it twice, through the lines of the besiegers. The marquis de la Force, who commanded in the town, shewed more judgment in defending, than the king's troops did in attacking. This was the same James Nonpar de la Force, who had been so surprizingly preserved in his infancy from the massacre of S. Bartholomew, and who was afterwards made marshal of France by Louis XIII. The inhabitants of Montauban, grown desperate by the example of Clerac, were determined sooner to bury themselves under the ruins of the town, than to surrender.

The constable unable to carry his point by temporal arms, had recourse to spiritual. He sent for a Spanish Carmelite, who was said to have contributed to the victory of the Imperial army of catholics over the protestants, in the neighbourhood of Prague. The Carmelite, whose name was Dominic, arrived at the camp, gave his benediction to the army, distributed *Agnus Dei's*, and said to the king, "You must fire four hundred cannon shot, and at the four hundredth Montauban will capitulate." Perhaps four hundred cannon balls well directed, might have produced this effect: Louis ordered the cannon to be fired; but Montauban did not capitulate; so that he was obliged to raise the siege.

This affront rendered the king less respectable to the catholics, and less formidable to the Huguenots. The
Dec. constable was odious to all the world. He took the
1621 king with him to wreak his vengeance for the disgrace before

before Montauban, on a little town of Guienne, called Monheur; where a fever put an end to his life. So usual a thing was pillage and robbery in those days, that as he was dying, he saw himself plundered of his furniture, his equipage, and money, by his domestics, and soldiers. There was hardly a winding sheet left to bury the most powerful man in the kingdom, who with one hand had held the constable's sword, and with the other the seals of France: he died hated by the people and by his master.

Louis XIII. was unfortunately engaged in a war against part of his own subjects. The duke de Luines designed this war, to keep his master embarrassed; and to raise himself to the post of constable of France. The king had been accustomed to look upon the war as indispensable. The remonstrance which du Pleffis-Mornay made him, at very near fourscore years of age, deserves to be transmitted to posterity. After exhausting the most specious arguments, he wrote to him in these terms: "For a king to wage war against his subjects, is only a mark of weakness. Authority depends on the peaceful submission of the people; and is established by the prudence and justice of him who governs. Military force ought not to be exerted but against a foreign enemy. The late king would have sent these new statesmen to school, to learn the first principles of politics: they are like unskilful surgeons, who have no other remedies to propose but caustics and amputations, and would advise a man to cut off a sound arm together with that which is mortified."

The court were not persuaded by these reasons. The diseased arm threw the body into too many convulsions; so that Louis XIII. not having the same strength of mind as his father, who kept the protestants within bounds, thought he should be able to reduce them no other way than by force of arms. He therefore marched again into the provinces beyond the Loire, at the head of a small army, of about thirteen or fourteen thousand men. A few more regiments were quartered in those provinces.

provinces. The bad state of the revenue did not permit the raising of a larger army; but the Huguenots had not a stronger body to oppose them.

Soubise, the duke of Rohan's brother, entrenched himself with eight thousand men in the isle of Rhé, which is separated from the lower Poitou by a small arm of the sea. The king crossed over at the head of his army at low water, intirely defeated the enemy, and 1622 compelled Soubise to retire to England. It was impossible to shew greater intrepidity, or to gain a completer victory. This prince had hardly any other foible than that of being governed by favourites; a foible which, in his public and private affairs, and even in his most trifling amusements, rendered him unhappy all his life. With regard to his victory, it only excited the Calvinist leaders to look out for new resources.

Still both sides negotiated more than they fought, as had been the case at the time of the league, and in all the civil wars. Many a rebel lord, condemned to death by parliament, obtained rewards and honours while he was executed in effigy. This happened to the marquis de la Force, who had driven the royal army from before Montauban, and who still kept the field against his majesty. He had a present of two hundred thousand crowns, with a marshal's staff. A higher price would not have been paid for the most eminent services. Chatillon, grandson of the admiral Coligni, sold the town of Aiguemortes to the king, and was likewise made marshal. The obedience of several others was purchased in a similar manner: Lesdiguières alone disposed of his religion. Possessed at that time of strong holds in Dauphiny, and still professing the reformed religion, he suffered himself to be openly solicited by the Huguenots to return to their party, while he left the king in suspense whether he would not comply with their desire.

It was proposed in council either to kill him or to 1622 make him constable: the king preferred the latter; and Lesdiguières instantly turned catholic. This was a necessary step for the post of constable, but not for being marshal of France: custom had settled it so. The constable's

stable's sword might have been in the hands of an Huguenot, as the administration of the finances had been for a long time: but it was unfit that he who had the command of the king's armies, and the chief direction in council, should profess the religion of the Calvinists, at the same time that he was combating their party. Such a recantation as that of Lesdiguières would have disgraced any private person, who had been actuated by a paltry interest; but in higher pursuits of ambition, men are strangers to shame.

Thus was Louis XIII. incessantly obliged to bribe his servants, and to negotiate with rebels. He laid siege to Montpellier; but apprehensive of the same disgrace as that which he had met with before Montauban, he consented to be admitted into the town, on condition of confirming the edict of Nantes, together with all their privileges. One would imagine, that by leaving the rest of the protestant towns in possession of their rights, and by following the counsel of du Plessis Mornay, he might have got rid of the war; and we find that, notwithstanding his victory in the isle of Rhé, he gained very little by its continuance.

The duke of Rohan, perceiving that every body was negotiating, followed the general example. It was he that prevailed on the inhabitants of Montpellier to admit the king into the town. He set on foot, and concluded at Privas, a general peace with the constable de Lesdiguières. The king paid him as he had done the 1622 rest, and gave him the dukedom of Valois as a security.

Things were left on the footing they stood before the protestants had recourse to arms. Thus the king and the nation were at a vast expence for nothing. A few poor wretches were hanged in the course of the war, while the heads of the rebellion came off with rewards.

During these commotions the council of Louis XIII. had been as much divided as the kingdom. The prince of Condé attended the king, and would fain command the army and the state. The ministers could not agree; they had pressed his majesty to confer the office of constable on Lesdiguières, merely to lessen the authority of the
the

the prince of Condé. Tired of quarrelling in the cabinet, the prince went to Rome, as soon as the peace was concluded, to solicit a brief for rendering the benefices he possessed, hereditary in his family. He might have transmitted them to his posterity without this brief, which he never obtained. Scarce could he prevail upon the court of Rome to give him the title of highness; and the cardinal priests made no difficulty to take precedence of him. This was all the fruit of his journey to Rome.

The court eased of the burden of a ruinous civil war, fell a prey to new intrigues. The ministers were at open variance with one another; and the king mistrusted them all.

It clearly appeared, after the death of the constable de Luines, that the prosecution of the queen-mother had been more owing to that minister than to his majesty. This princess presided in council as soon as the favourite expired. The better to establish her reviving authority, she would fain make cardinal Richelieu, who was her favourite, steward of her household, and indebted to her for the purple, a member of the council. Reckoning to govern through his means, she solicited the king to admit him into the ministry. Almost all the memoirs of that time mention the king's repugnance. The man in whom he afterwards reposed his whole confidence, he now treated as a knave; and continually found fault with his morals.

This bigotted prince, full of scruple and suspicion, had a mortal aversion to the cardinal's amours, which were publicly known, and attended with ridiculous circumstances. He used to dress like a cavalier; and after writing on theology, he would make love in the character of a beau. By the Memoirs of cardinal de Retz it appears, that there was a mixture of pedantry with this air of ridicule. But there was no necessity for this testimony of de Retz, since we have seen the love theses, which Richelieu caused to be defended at his niece's, in the nature of theological theses in the schools of the Sorbonne. The memoirs of those times inform us

further, that he carried his presumptuous desires, whether real or fictitious, as high as the reigning queen, Anne of Austria, and that he never forgave the raileries he underwent upon that score. I take notice of these anecdotes, because they had a great influence on important events. In the first place they shew us, that the ridiculous gallantry of this celebrated cardinal, did not in the least diminish the greatness of the statesman, and that the foibles of private life may very well be united with public heroism. Secondly, they are a kind of demonstration, among many others, that the Political Testament published in his name cannot have been written by him. It was impossible for cardinal Richelieu, with whose amorous intrigues Louis XIII. was but too well acquainted, or for the known lover of Marion Delorme, to have the effrontery to recommend chastity to the chaste Louis XIII. at that time forty years old, and loaded with infirmities.

So strong was the king's repugnance to admit him, that the queen was obliged to draw in the superintendant* la Vieuville, who at that time had the chief weight in the ministry, and who was much more afraid than Louis XIII. of cardinal Richelieu.

Montchal, archbishop of Toulouse, relates that the April cardinal swore upon the sacramental wafer to preserve^{29,} his friendship and fidelity to the superintendant la Vieuville inviolate.¹⁶²⁴ Thus at length he got a share in the administration against the inclination of the king and the other members. But he had neither the precedence nor first seat, which was still possessed by the cardinal de la Rochefoucault; nor the chief weight, which la Vieuville preserved for some time: in short, he had no department, no superiority over the rest; "All he de-
"sired," said queen Mary de Medicis in a letter to the king her son, "was sometimes to take his seat in council." Thus he passed the first months after his admittance into the ministry.

* The chief director of the finances. T.

I am aware how little these particulars of themselves deserve to attract our attention, which should be fixed only on great and important events: but here they are necessary, in order to destroy the public prejudice so long subsisting, that cardinal Richelieu was prime minister and absolute master, as soon as he became member of the council. It is this very prejudice that drew these words from the imposing author of the Political Testament; "When your majesty resolved to grant me admittance into your council, and at the same time a great share of your confidence, I promised you I should employ all my attention to humble the pride of the nobility, to destroy the Huguenots, and to raise your reputation in foreign countries."

It is evident that cardinal Richelieu could not speak in this manner, since he had not the king's confidence in the beginning. I shall not take notice of the imprudence of a minister, who sets out with telling his master, "that he will raise his reputation," and thus making him sensible that his reputation was low. Neither shall I enter into a multitude of invincible arguments, by which it is proved that the Political Testament attributed to Richelieu cannot possibly be the production of that cardinal†: but I return to his administration.

What was afterwards said in regard to his Mausoleum erected in the Sorbonne, *magnum disputandi argumentum*, is the real character of his abilities and administration. It is extremely difficult to have a right idea of a man, who has been so much flattered by friends, and abused by enemies. He had to contend with the house of Austria, with the Calvinists, with the grandees of the kingdom, with his benefactress the queen-mother, with the king's brother, with the queen-consort whom he once dared to make love to, and, in short, with the king himself, to whom he was ever useful, and often odious. It was impossible but some would defame him by libels: he therefore took care to have them answered

† See the Historical Commentary, &c. pages 36 & 187. T. by

by panegyrics. We must not give credit to either, but take an impartial view of facts.

In order to ascertain those facts, we ought to make a proper choice of books. What can any body think, for instance, of the writer of father Joseph's life, who gives us a letter from the cardinal to that famous Capuchin, penned, as he says, immediately after his being admitted into the council: "As you are the principal instrument, that God has made use of to conduct me through all the honours to which I see myself raised, I think it my duty to inform you, that the king has been pleased to confer the post of prime minister upon me at the request of the queen."

The cardinal did not receive his patent of prime minister till 1629, and Joseph the Capuchin had neither conducted him to nor through honours.

Books in general are but too full of similar suppositions, so that it is a task of no little difficulty to discriminate truth from falsehood. Let us here give an abstract of the tempestuous ministry, or rather the reign of cardinal Richelieu.

C H A P. CLXXVI.

Of Cardinal Richelieu's Administration.

THE superintendant la Vieuville, who had lent a hand to cardinal Richelieu to step into the administration, was the first man he crushed, at the end of six months, notwithstanding the oath he had taken on the sacramental wafer. La Vieuville was privately accused of misdemeanors, a charge that may be brought at any time against a superintendant.

La Vieuville owed his greatness to the chancellor de Sillery, and had been the cause of his disgrace. He was ruined in his turn by the man, who was indebted to him for his preferment. These vicissitudes, so common in all courts, were still more so in that of Louis

XIII. This minister was imprisoned in the castle of Amboise. He had begun the treaty of marriage between Henrietta, sister of Louis XIII. and Charles prince of Wales, who was soon afterwards king of Great-Britain. The cardinal finished the treaty in spite of the courts of Rome and Madrid.

He secretly favoured the protestants of Germany, at the same time that he had formed a design to oppress those of France.

Before his administration, treaties had been set on foot to no purpose, with all the princes in Italy, to prevent the house of Austria, at that time very powerful, from remaining mistress of the Valteline.

This small province professed the catholic religion, and belonged to the Grisons, who were protestants. The Spaniards wanted to join those valleys to the Milanese. The duke of Savoy and the Venetians, in concert with France, were for opposing any aggrandizement of the house of Austria in Italy. At length pope Urban VIII. obtained the sequestration of this province into his hands, and flattered himself with the hopes of keeping it.

Marquemont, the French ambassador at Rome, wrote a long letter to Richelieu, exposing all the difficulties of this important affair. The cardinal sent him this celebrated answer: "The king has changed his council, and the ministry their maxims: an army shall be sent to the Valteline, which will render the pope less dubious, and the Spaniards more tractable." Accordingly the marquis de Cœuvres entered the Valteline with an army. No respect was paid to the pope's colours; and the country was rescued from an Austrian invasion. This was the first step towards restoring France to its due weight and influence in Europe.

1625. The preceding ministers had ever wanted money, whereas Richelieu was able to lend three millions two hundred thousand livres to the Dutch, to enable them to maintain the war against the Spanish branch of Austria their ancient sovereign. He likewise sent supplies to that famous count Mansfeldt, who almost singly maintained

maintained the cause of the elector Palatine, and of the German protestants, against the imperial family.

After arming the foreign protestants in this manner, it was natural to expect that the Spanish ministry would stir up those of France, and return them (as Mirabel the Spanish ambassador expressed himself) the money given to the Dutch. Accordingly the Huguenots, excited and paid by Spain, renewed the civil war. Ever since the time of Charles V. and Francis I. that barbarous policy has prevailed among catholic princes, of supporting protestants abroad, and persecuting them at home. During this new war against the duke of Rohan and his party, the cardinal continued to negotiate with the powers whom he had affronted; and neither the emperor Ferdinand II. nor Philip IV. king of Spain, commenced hostilities against France.

Rochelle was growing powerful. At that time she had very near as many ships as the king; and was ambitious of imitating the example of Holland; which she might have compassed, had she found allies, among foreign nations of her own religion. But cardinal Richelieu contrived to arm against her those very Dutch, whose religious interests should have determined them to the other side; and even to engage the English in the same cause, though it seemed to be much more their interest to defend this city. The money already given, and further promised to the United Provinces, tempted them to fit out a fleet against those whom they called their brethren: so that his catholic majesty was assisting the Calvinists with money, and the Dutch protestants were fighting for the catholic religion; while cardinal Richelieu was driving the pope's troops out of the Valteline, in favour of the Grisons, who were Hu-¹⁶²⁵ guenots.

It is a matter of surprize that Soubise, who had the command of the Rochelle fleet, should venture to attack the Dutch Squadron near the isle of Rhé, and gain an advantage over a nation, who were esteemed the best¹⁶²⁵ sailors in the world. This success at any other time would have rendered Rochelle a potent republic.

XIII. This minister was imprisoned in the castle of Amboise. He had begun the treaty of marriage between Henrietta, sister of Louis XIII. and Charles prince of Wales, who was soon afterwards king of Great-Britain. The cardinal finished the treaty in spite of the courts of Rome and Madrid.

He secretly favoured the protestants of Germany, at the same time that he had formed a design to oppress those of France.

Before his administration, treaties had been set on foot to no purpose, with all the princes in Italy, to prevent the house of Austria, at that time very powerful, from remaining mistress of the Valteline.

This small province professed the catholic religion, and belonged to the Grisons, who were protestants. The Spaniards wanted to join those valleys to the Milanese. The duke of Savoy and the Venetians, in concert with France, were for opposing any aggrandizement of the house of Austria in Italy. At length pope Urban VIII. obtained the sequestration of this province into his hands, and flattered himself with the hopes of keeping it.

Marquemont, the French ambassador at Rome, wrote a long letter to Richelieu, exposing all the difficulties of this important affair. The cardinal sent him this celebrated answer: "The king has changed his council, and the ministry their maxims: an army shall be sent to the Valteline, which will render the pope less dubious, and the Spaniards more tractable." Accordingly the marquis de Cœuvres entered the Valteline with an army. No respect was paid to the pope's colours; and the country was rescued from an Austrian invasion. This was the first step towards restoring France to its due weight and influence in Europe.

1625. The preceding ministers had ever wanted money, whereas Richelieu was able to lend three millions two hundred thousand livres to the Dutch, to enable them to maintain the war against the Spanish branch of Austria their ancient sovereign. He likewise sent supplies to that famous count Mansfeldt, who almost singly maintained

maintained the cause of the elector Palatine, and of the German protestants, against the imperial family.

After arming the foreign protestants in this manner, it was natural to expect that the Spanish ministry would stir up those of France, and return them (as Mirabel the Spanish ambassador expressed himself) the money given to the Dutch. Accordingly the Huguenots, excited and paid by Spain, renewed the civil war. Ever since the time of Charles V. and Francis I. that barbarous policy has prevailed among catholic princes, of supporting protestants abroad, and persecuting them at home. During this new war against the duke of Rohan and his party, the cardinal continued to negotiate with the powers whom he had affronted; and neither the emperor Ferdinand II. nor Philip IV. King of Spain, commenced hostilities against France.

Rochelle was growing powerful. At that time she had very near as many ships as the king; and was ambitious of imitating the example of Holland; which she might have compassed, had she found allies, among foreign nations of her own religion. But cardinal Richelieu contrived to arm against her those very Dutch, whose religious interests should have determined them to the other side; and even to engage the English in the same cause, though it seemed to be much more their interest to defend this city. The money already given, and further promised to the United Provinces, tempted them to fit out a fleet against those whom they called their brethren: so that his catholic majesty was assisting the Calvinists with money, and the Dutch protestants were fighting for the catholic religion; while cardinal Richelieu was driving the pope's troops out of the Valteline, in favour of the Grisons, who were Hu-1625 guenots.

It is a matter of surprize that Soubise, who had the command of the Rochelle fleet, should venture to attack the Dutch Squadron near the isle of Rhé, and gain an advantage over a nation, who were esteemed the best 1625 sailors in the world. This success at any other time would have rendered Rochelle a potent republic.

Louis XIII. at that time had an admiral and no fleet. The cardinal, at his entering upon the administration, had found every thing wanting, or out of repair; and it was impossible for him to raise a marine in the space of a twelvemonth. Scarce could he fit out ten or twelve small ships of war. The duke of Montmorency, at that time admiral, the same who afterwards made so tragical an exit, was obliged to go on board the Dutch admiral; and it was by the assistance of Dutch and English ships that the Rochelle fleet was beaten.

This victory convinced the minister of the necessity of rendering his master powerful both by sea and land, since he had the protestant party to subdue in France, and the Austrian power to undermine in Europe. This
1626 induced him to grant peace to the Huguenots, in order to have time to settle himself.

The cardinal had much greater enemies to struggle with at court. Not one prince of the blood loved him. Gaston, brother of Louis XIII. detested him. Mary de Medicis began to look upon her own creature with a jealous eye. Almost all the grandees were a caballing.
1626 He deprived the duke of Montmorency of the post of admiral, and took it to himself under another name; by which means he rendered the duke his implacable enemy. Two sons of Henry IV. Cæsar of Vendome and the grand prior, opposed his will; and he ordered them to be imprisoned at Vincennes. Marshal Ornano, and Talleraud Chalais set Gaston against him. The cardinal not only charged them with conspiring against the king; but involved the count de Soissons, who was a prince of the blood, Gaston the king's brother, and even the queen-consort, in the conspiracy.

At one time depositions were made that their design was to assassinate his majesty; at another time that they proposed to declare him impotent, then to confine him in a monastery, and to marry the queen to Gaston his brother. These two accusations were contradictory to each other, and neither of them were probable. The
201 real crime was their having joined against the minister, and even hinted at taking away his life. Chalais was
3 condemned

condemned by commissaries; and executed at Nants. Marshal Ornano died at Vincennes: the count de Soissons fled to Italy: the duchess of Chevreuse, whom the cardinal had once made love to, though now he accused her of entering into the conspiracy against him, was pursued by his guards, and very near being taken; she escaped however with difficulty, and went over to England*. The king's brother was watched and ill treated. Anne of Austria was summoned before the council, who forbade her to speak to any man at court, but in the presence of the king her husband; and moreover, they obliged her to sign a declaration of her guilt.

Suspicion, fear, and desolation, possessed the royal family, and the whole court. Louis XIII. was not the least unhappy man in his kingdom; afraid of his wife and his brother, confounded in the presence of his mother, whom he had heretofore treated so very ill, and who used frequently to let drop expressions that shewed she did not forget it; and confounded still more before the cardinal, whose yoke began to weigh heavy upon him. The crisis of foreign affairs gave him fresh uneasiness; so that the cardinal kept fast hold of him by his fears and apprehensions, as also by the necessity of crushing the conspiracies at home, and of preserving his reputation abroad.

At that time three ministers, equally powerful, determined nearly the fate of Europe; Olivarez in Spain, Buckingham in England, and Richelieu in France. They all three hated each other, and all three were negotiating to each other's prejudice. Cardinal Richelieu was quarrelling with the duke of Buckingham at the very time that the English were supplying him with ships against Rochelle; and he was entering into a league with the duke d'Olivarez, just when he had wrested the Valteline from the king of Spain.

* She swam across the river Somme, in order to reach Calais. V.

Of these three ministers, the duke of Buckingham was reckoned the least politic; he figured as a favourite and as a great lord, frank, open and daring, but not as a statesman; governing king Charles I. not by intrigue, but by the ascendant he had gained over the father, and which he preserved over the son. He was the handsomest man in his time, and withal the proudest, and the most generous. He fancied that the women could not withstand the charms of his person, nor the men the superiority of his genius. Intoxicated with this double self-love, he had conducted king Charles, when prince of Wales, into Spain, to make him marry an Infanta, and to shine at that court. There it was that, adding Spanish gallantry to English boldness, he made an attack upon the wife of the prime minister Olivarez, by which indiscretion the prince's marriage was broke off. Having afterwards negotiated a match between Charles I. and the princess Henrietta, he went over to France in 1625, to conduct the new queen to England; and here he was very near spoiling the affair by a bolder indiscretion. He made his addresses to queen Anne of Austria, not scrupling to declare his love; though he could expect nothing from such an adventure, but the empty honour of having dared to explain himself. The queen, educated in the notions of gallantry at that time permitted in Spain, looked upon this temerity of the duke of Buckingham, only as an homage paid to her beauty, and such as could no way offend her virtue.

The behaviour of the duke of Buckingham was displeasing to the court of France, but did not prove a subject of ridicule, the presumption of great personages being never considered in that light. He brought the princess Henrietta to London, and with her his passion for the queen, which had increased since he had been so vain as to declare it. This vanity made him undertake a second journey to the court of France, under pretence of concluding a treaty against the duke d'Olivarez, as the cardinal had made one with Olivarez against England. The true reason, which indeed he did not endeavour

deavour to conceal, was to pay his respects to the queen: but this they would not permit him to do; and the king drove away several of his wife's domestics, who were accused of having encouraged the temerity of the duke of Buckingham. This Englishman made his master declare war against France, merely because that court had refused him the liberty of carrying on his amour. Such an adventure seemed more adapted to the times of Amadis de Gaul. So connected and interwoven are the affairs of this world, that the romantic amours of the duke of Buckingham produced a religious war, and the taking of Rochelle. 1627

Party-leaders improve every circumstance in their favour. The duke of Rohan, as politic in his designs as Buckingham had been vain in his, obtained, in consequence of the Englishman's resentment, a fleet of an hundred transports. Rochelle and the whole protestant party were quiet: he spirited them up, and persuaded the Rochellers to admit the English fleet, not into the town itself, but into the isle of Rhé. The duke of Buckingham made a descent upon that island with about seven thousand men. They had only one small fort to take, in order to become masters of the island, and to separate Rochelle for ever from France. The protestant party would then have been unconquerable. The kingdom must have been divided, and all the cardinal's projects would have vanished into smoke; had the duke of Buckingham been as great, or at least as fortunate, a soldier, as he had shewn himself bold and enterprising.

The marquis, afterwards marshal de Thoiras, saved July, the glory of France, by preserving the isle of Rhé with 1627 a few troops, against the English, who were greatly superior in number. This gave Louis XIII. time to send an army before Rochelle. His brother Gaston commanded the troops at first; but the king himself soon arrived, attended by the cardinal. Buckingham was obliged to return to England, after he had lost half his men, without even having thrown any succours into Rochelle; so that he appeared before the town only to hasten

hasten its ruin. The duke of Rohan was absent from this city, which he had spirited up to arms, and exposed to danger. He was maintaining the war in Languedoc, against the prince of Condé, and the duke of Montmorency.

These great men were all three fighting for themselves; the duke of Rohan to be perpetual chief of the party; the prince of Condé, at the head of the king's forces, to recover his lost influence at court; the duke of Montmorency at the head of troops raised by himself and of his own authority, to become absolutely master in Languedoc, of which he was governor, and to render himself independent, like Lesdiguières. Thus Rochelle found no other support but herself. The citizens animated by two powerful incentives, religion and the love of liberty, elected a mayor whose name was Guiton, a man more resolute than themselves. Before he would accept of a post which invested him with the civil and military command, he took up a poniard, and holding it in his hand, "I accept the post of mayor, said he, on condition of plunging this poniard into the breast of the first man that shall propose to surrender; and of my being served in the same manner, if ever I talk of capitulating."

While Rochelle was preparing to make a most vigorous defence, cardinal Richelieu, employed every resource to subdue her. Ships were built with the utmost expedition, the troops before the town were reinforced, more artillery was sent for, and even the Spaniards were prevailed on to assist him; for by taking advantage of the aversion of the duke d'Olivarez against Buckingham, by making a right use of the interests of religion, and by promising every thing the court of Madrid could desire, he obtained a fleet from the king of Spain at that time the natural enemy of France, in order to deprive the Rochellers of all hopes of further assistance from England. The duke d'Olivarez sent Frederic of Toledo, with a fleet of forty sail before the harbour of Rochelle.

The Spanish admiral arrived. Would one imagine that a punctilio should defeat the intent of those suc-
cours

cours, and that the Spanish fleet should return to their own ports, only because Louis would not suffer their 1628 admiral to be covered in his presence? Whether this 1629 trifle determined so important an affair, as but too often happens, or whether new differences about the Mantuan succession had soured the court of Madrid, certain it is, that the fleet did but just appear, and sailed back again. Perhaps the duke d'Olivarez, sent it only to shew the French minister how strong he was.

The duke of Buckingham prepared a new embarkation to save the town. There was a possibility of his frustrating in a very little time all the endeavours of the king of France. The French court have been constantly of opinion, that to ward off this blow cardinal Richelieu took advantage of that very passion, which Buckingham had for Anne of Austria, and that the queen was desired to write to the duke. She begged of him, as it is said, that he would at least defer the expedition; and it is asserted that his passion got the better of all considerations of honour and glory.

This singular anecdote has gained such credit, that we could not avoid relating it: we may observe however, that it is neither repugnant to the character of Buckingham, nor to the spirit of the court; and indeed it is impossible to comprehend how the duke of Buckingham should content himself with sending a few ships, which only appeared off the coast of France, and returned to England without making any attempt. The public interest is so often sacrificed to the private intrigues of a court, that we ought by no means to be surprized that the weak Charles I. in feigning at that time to protect, should betray the inhabitants of Rochelle, merely to gratify the romantic passion of his favourite. General Ludlow, who examined the king's papers, when they were seized by the parliament, asserts that he saw a letter signed *Charles Rex*, in which that monarch ordered sir John Pennington, who commanded the squadron, to follow in every respect the orders of the king of France, while he should be before Rochelle, and to sink every English ship, the captains

tains of which should be unwilling to obey him. If any thing could justify the cruelty; with which the English afterwards treated their king, it would be such a letter.

It is not less singular, that the cardinal alone should command the siege, while the king was returned to Paris. He had a general's commission; and this was his first essay in the military art. He was a proof that resolution and genius are able to surmount the greatest difficulties; being as exact in disciplining the troops, as he had been assiduous in establishing a police at Paris; both of which he found a hard task to compass. It was impossible to take Rochelle, while it continued open to an English fleet; therefore the port must be locked up, and the sea subdued. In the preceding civil war Pompey Targoni, an Italian engineer, had contrived a barricado at the time when Louis XIII. wanted to besiege this town, just as the peace was concluded. The cardinal pursued this plan: the ocean overset his work; yet he was resolved to begin it again. He ordered a mole to be made in the sea, about four thousand seven hundred feet long; and the winds destroyed it. This did not discourage him: with Quintus Curtius in his hand, where he found the description of the siege of Tyre by Alexander, he set his people again to work; and by the help of two Frenchmen, Metesau and Tiriau, the mole was in a condition to resist the winds and waves.

Mar. Louis XIII. came to the siege, and staid from the 1628 month of March 1628, till the town surrendered.

Often present at the attacks, and setting an example to his officers, he hastened the grand work of the mole: but still there was danger lest another English fleet should come and destroy it. Fortune favoured this enterprize in every thing. The duke of Buckingham was Sept. 1628 ready to sail with a formidable fleet for Rochelle, when an Irish fanatic, named Felton, assassinated him with a knife; nor was it ever possible to find out his accomplices.

In the meanwhile Rochelle, destitute of succours, and provisions, supported herself by her courage alone.

The

The mother and sister of the duke of Rohan, though reduced to extremity of want, spirited up the citizens. Wretches ready to expire with hunger deplored their state before Guiton the mayor, who made answer: "That if there was only one man left, still the gates must be kept shut."

The hopes of the Rochellers revived at the sight of the fleet equipped by Buckingham, which set out at length under the command of the Earl of Lindsey. But they could not break through the mole. The ships were kept off by a battery of forty pieces of cannon, erected on a wooden fort in the sea. Louis stood on this very fort, exposed to the artillery of the enemy's fleet, whose efforts proved ineffectual.

At length famine overcame the courage of the Rochellers, and after a twelve month's siege, in which they defended themselves without the least succour, they were obliged to surrender, notwithstanding the mayor's poniard, which still lay on the table in the town house, to stab any man that should mention a word of capitulating. It is observable, that neither Louis XIII. as king, nor cardinal Richelieu as minister, nor the marshals of France as crown officers, subscribed their names to the capitulation. It was signed only by two camp marshals.* Rochelle was only deprived of its privileges; but no body suffered death. The catholic religion was re-established both in town and country; and the inhabitants were allowed the exercise of Calvinism, the only thing that was left them.

Cardinal Richelieu would not leave his work unfinished. He marched his troops towards the other provinces, where the Protestants had so many cautionary towns, and where their numbers still rendered them formidable. The party was to be intirely reduced and disarmed, before he could securely employ his whole strength against the house of Austria in Germany, Italy, Flan-

* The first military rank in France is that of marshal of France, the second that of lieutenant-general, and the third that of *marechal de camp*, or camp marshal. T.

ders, and on the frontiers of Spain. In a word, it was necessary that the states should be quiet and united, before he could disturb or divide the dominions of other princes.

The interest of France invited her arms into Italy, to establish a duke of Mantua, independent of Spain, the late sovereign being deceased. Gustavus Adolphus also wanted to make a descent upon Germany, and France was to support him in this expedition.

In these critical circumstances, the duke of Rohan, unshaken amidst the ruins of his party, treated with the king of Spain, who promised him succours, though the duke had acted against him only a year before this. Philip IV. having consulted his council, agreed to pay three hundred thousand ducats a year to the head of the French Calvinists. But the money came with some difficulty. In the mean time the king's troops ravaged Languedoc. Privas was given up to be plundered, and the inhabitants were put to the sword. The duke of Rohan, unable to continue the war, found once more the secret of concluding a general peace for the whole party, as favourable as could be expected. The very man, who had lately been in treaty with the king of Spain, as the head of the Calvinists, negociated with the king of France his master at the time that he stood condemned as a rebel by the parliament; and after having taken Spanish money to maintain his troops, he received an hundred thousand crowns of Louis XIII. to pay them off, and to disband
1628 them.

The rest of the protestant towns were treated in the same manner as Rochelle; they were deprived of their fortifications, and of every privilege that might be dangerous to the state: but they were allowed to enjoy liberty of conscience, to have their temples, their municipal laws, and their courts of justice, which could do no harm. All was made quiet. The great body of protestants, instead of establishing an independent state, were disarmed and crushed. Neither the Swiss nor the Dutch were so powerful as the French Huguenots,
when

when the former erected themselves into independent sovereignties. Geneva, though a trifling place, asserted her liberty. Yet the Calvinists of France were demolished. The reason is, their people were scattered about the provinces; one half of the inhabitants and the parliaments were catholics; the king's forces fell upon their country, which was quite open; they were attacked by superior numbers, and by disciplined troops; in a word, they had to deal with cardinal Richelieu.

Never did Louis XIII. whose character is not sufficiently known, gain so much personal glory: for while his troops, after the taking of Rochelle, were reducing the Huguenots, he maintained his allies in Italy; he marched an army over the Alps in the midst of a severe ^{Mar.} winter, to the assistance of the duke of Mantua; he ¹⁶²⁹ forced three barricados at the pass of Susa, and making himself master of the last town, he obliged the duke of Savoy to join him, and drove the Spaniards from before Casal.

In the mean time cardinal Richelieu was negotiating with all, and against most of, the sovereigns in Europe. He sent a Capuchin friar to the diet of Ratisbon, to deceive the Germans, and to tie up the emperor's hands in Italy. At the same time Charnacé was commissioned to encourage Gustavus Adolphus to make a descent upon Germany; an enterprize to which that prince was already very much disposed. Richelieu thought of making all Europe tremble, while the cabal of Gaston and the two queens were in vain endeavouring to undermine him at court. His being a favourite occasioned more disturbances in the cabinet, then were raised by his intrigues in foreign states. It is not to be imagined that those disturbances were the effect of profound policy, or of well concerted schemes, by which a strong and artful party conspired to turn him out, and to substitute a successor capable of filling his place. Whim and caprice, which influence mankind in the most important affairs, were in great measure the cause of those unhappy divisions. The queen-mother, though she had a seat in council; and had been regent of the provinces

on this side of the Loire during her son's expedition to Rochelle, was still disgusted with cardinal Richelieu, who affected to depend on her no longer. The memoirs written in defence of that princess, relate, that the cardinal having been to pay her a visit, and her majesty inquiring about his health, he answered with trembling lips, and inflamed with choler, "I am bet-
 1629" ter than they, who are present, wish me." The queen was very angry; the cardinal fell into a passion: he asked pardon; the queen was pacified: but two days after they quarrelled again; for though policy may get the better of passion in the cabinet, it cannot always have that command in private conversation.

Nov. Mary de Medicis immediately dismissed the cardinal
 21, from his place of steward of the household. The first
 1629 fruit of this quarrel, was the patent of prime minister, which the king wrote with his own hand in favour of the cardinal, addressing his discourse to him personally, extolling his courage and magnanimity, and leaving a blank for his salary, that the cardinal might fill it up himself. He was already high admiral of France, under the name of superintendant of the marine; and having deprived the Calvinists of their cautionary towns, he possessed himself of Saumur, Angers, Honfleur, Havre de Grace, Oleron, and the isle of Rhé, which were his strong holds to protect him against his enemies. He had guards; his pomp eclipsed the dignity of the throne; the ensigns of royalty attended him; and all authority centered in his person.

The state of affairs in Europe, rendered him more necessary than ever both to his king and to the state. The emperor Ferdinand II. after the battle of Prague, had made himself despotic in Germany, and was become powerful in Italy. His troops had laid siege to Mantua. Savoy was wavering betwixt France and the house of Austria. The marquiss of Spinola occupied the duchy of Montferrat with a Spanish army. The cardinal, desirous of entering the lists with Spinola, prevailed on the king to appoint him generalissimo of the army marching into Italy; and his majesty gave
 orders

orders for his troops to pay the same obedience to his minister, as to himself in person. Richelieu acting as constable of France, and with two marshals under him, marched into Savoy. He negotiated upon the road, but like a king; and desired the duke of Savoy to meet him at Lyons; which the duke refused. The French¹⁶³⁰ made themselves masters of Pignerol and Chamberry in two days. At length the king himself set out for Savoy, in company with the two queens, his brother, and in short a whole court that hated the cardinal, but were obliged to behold his triumphs. Richelieu turned back to meet the king at Grenoble; and they proceeded together to Savoy. At this very time Louis XIII. was seized with a contagious distemper, which obliged him to return to Lyons. In the mean while the duke of Montmorency, with a small body of troops, obtained a complete victory at Vegliano over the Imperialists, Spaniards, and Savoyards; where he wounded general^{July 1630} Doria, and took him prisoner. This action gained the duke great glory. The king wrote to him these words; "I feel myself as much obliged to you as a king can be." The obligation, however, did not prevent this great man from dying two years after upon a scaffold.

Nothing less than such a victory could have maintained the glory and interest of France, while the Imperialists were taking and plundering Mantua, pursuing the duke protected by Louis XIII. and beating the Venetians his allies. The cardinal's chief enemies being at court, he let the duke of Montmorency fight the enemies of France, while he watched those who were undermining him with his majesty. The king was then a dying at Lyons. The favourites of the queen-consort shewed themselves too eager, in proposing to Gaston to marry his brother's wife, who was soon expected to be a widow. Richelieu was preparing to retire to Avignon: but the king recovered; and all those who had conceived any hopes from his death, were confounded. The cardinal attended him to Paris; where he found more intrigues going on than in Italy between the empire, Spain, Venice, Savoy, Rome, and France.

Mirabel,

Mirabel, the Spanish ambassador, had entered into a league against him with the two queens. The two brothers of the name of Marillac, one a marshal of France, the other keeper of the seals, though indebted to him for their preferment, had conceived hopes of destroying him, and succeeding in his place. The marshal de Bassompierre, without any pretensions, was in the secret; while Beringhen, the king's chief valet de chambre informed the cabal of every thing that passed in the royal apartment. The queen-mother deprived the cardinal a second time of his post of steward of her household, which she had been obliged to return him; a post which the cardinal's proud spirit considered as far beneath him, though from another kind of pride he did not chuse to part with it. His niece, afterwards dutchess of Aiguillon, was dismissed; and Mary de Medicis, by dint of intreaties and complaints, prevailed on her son to discard his minister.

There is nothing in all these intrigues, but what we see every day in private families, where there happens to be a great number of servants: there they are common trifles; but here they were big with the fate of France and Europe. The negotiations with the princes of Italy, with Gustavus-Adolphus king of Sweden, with the United Provinces and the princes of Orange, against the emperor and Spain, were in Richelieu's hands: and could hardly be taken from him without endangering the state. Yet this weak prince, impelled by another motive, the secret envy he bore to the cardinal's superior merit, abandoned this useful minister; and, yielding to the solicitations and tears of his mother, he promised to remove him. The cardinal entered by a private door, into the very room where they had concluded his ruin. The king walked out, and took no notice of him; the minister looked upon himself as undone, and prepared to withdraw to Havre de Grace; as some months before he had had thoughts of retiring to Avignon. His ruin seemed inevitable, especially as the king had granted powers that very day to marshal de Marillac, Richelieu's avowed enemy, of making

making
in a l
ported
witho
lic h
once r

Th
at th

XIII.

finest

fures

who

weakl

gave r

very c

æra c

the k

to Ch

imme

king's

berg,

the v

him r

hour

cardin

just a

biter

chelic

ous d

son, r

of ex

shall

the th

can d

appea

Th

shal o

privil

before

thing

Vo

making war and peace in Piedmont. The cardinal was in a hurry to be gone: his mules had already transported part of his treasure five and thirty leagues off, without passing through any town, because of the public hatred. His friends however advised him to try once more what he could do with the king.

The cardinal waited upon his majesty at Versailles, at that time a small hunting-seat, purchased by Louis XIII. for twenty thousand crowns, now one of the finest palaces in Europe, and on which immense treasures have been expended by Louis XIV. The king, who had been so weak as to sacrifice his minister, Nov. weakly resigned himself once more into his hands, and ^{11,} gave up all those who had conspired his ruin. That ¹⁶³⁰ very day, which is still called *the day of dupes*, was the æra of the cardinal's absolute power. The next day the keeper of the seals was seized, and carried prisoner to Chauteaudun, where he died of vexation. Richelieu immediately dispatched a cabinet messenger in the king's name to the marshals de la Force and Schomberg, to arrest the marshal de Marillac in the midst of the very army, of which he was going to take upon him the sole command. The messenger arrived an hour after the marshal had received the news of the cardinal's disgrace. The marshal was made prisoner, just at the very moment when he thought himself arbiter of the state in conjunction with his brother. Richelieu determined to put this general to an ignominious death; and not being able to accuse him of treason, resolved to charge him with having been guilty of extortions. The trial lasted near two years: we shall here give the series of it, in order not to break the thread of this narration, and to shew what revenge can do, when armed with power and coloured with the appearance of justice.

The cardinal, not satisfied with depriving the marshal of the privilege of being tried by parliament, a privilege so often violated, ordered the trial at Verdun before commissaries, from whose severity he had every thing to expect. These commissaries having concluded,

notwithstanding the cardinal's many promises and threats, that the prisoner should be admitted to make his defence, the minister had the decree reversed, and appointed other judges, among whom were Marillac's most bitter enemies, particularly Paul Hey du Chastellet, known by a venomous satire against the two brothers. Never were the forms of justice, nor the rules of decency, more flagrantly violated. The cardinal broke through all bounds to such a degree, as to remove the prisoner, and to continue the trial at Ruel, his own country seat.

It is expressly forbid by the laws of the realm to detain a prisoner in a private house; but revenge and superior power know no laws. Neither was there more regard paid, in the course of his trial, to the canons of the church, than to decency and the forms of justice. Chateuneuf, the new keeper of the seals, who had but just succeeded the prisoner's brother, presided in a court, from whence he ought to have kept away for decency: though he was subdeacon, and possessed of church livings, he drew the indictment: and the cardinal got him a dispensation from Rome, empowering him to sit upon cases of life and death. Thus did a priest spill the blood of a fellow subject by the sword of justice; which sword he held in France, with the hand of another priest who lived at the further extremity of Italy.

By this it appears, that in criminal prosecutions the life of the prisoner depends on the desire of pleasing those who are in power. The judges were obliged to inquire into the marshal's whole life and conversation. They discovered some abuses in the execution of his office, some illicit though usual perquisites taken heretofore, either by himself or by his domestics, in building the citadel of Verdun: "It is a strange thing, said he to the court, that a man of my rank should be prosecuted with so much cruelty and injustice: my whole trial is only about a little hay, straw, stones, and lime."

And yet this general, covered with wounds, and after forty years service, was condemned to death, under
the

the same king who had granted rewards to upwards of thirty rebellious subjects.

At the very beginning of this extraordinary trial, the cardinal obtained orders from the king for Beringhen to quit the realm. Every body that had attempted, or that he suspected of having attempted to hurt him were imprisoned. Such cruelty, and so many mean acts of revenge, did not seem to become so great a soul, busied about the fate of Europe.

At that very time he was concluding with Gustavus-Adolphus the treaty which was to shake the throne of the emperor Ferdinand II. It cost France no more than three hundred thousand livres in hand, and twelve thousand livres a year, to divide Germany, and to overpower two emperors successively till the peace of Westphalia. Gustavus-Adolphus was now entering upon his victorious career, which gave France an opportunity of establishing her power. The perplexity of other nations ought to have made the court of France easy. But the want of moderation in the minister excited the public hatred, and rendered his enemies implacable. Gaston, 1631 duke of Orleans, the king's brother, retired to his estate at Orleans, and from thence to Lorraine, protesting that he would not set foot again in France, so long as the man who persecuted himself and his mother, continued to domineer over the kingdom. Richelieu caused a decree of council to be issued out, declaring all Gaston's friends guilty of high-treason. This decree was sent to parliament; the votes were equally divided; the king was incensed, and summoned the parliament to the Louvre; they went thither on foot, and addressed him on their knees. The resolution of the court of parliament was torn in their presence, and three of the principal members were banished.

The cardinal did not remain satisfied with maintaining his authority, now connected with that of his royal master: having forced the presumptive heir of the crown to retire from court, he no longer scrupled to put queen Mary de Medicis under arrest. This was a

delicate point, since the king was sorry for having once before, confined his mother, to oblige his favourite. The cardinal had recourse to the argument of the public welfare to stifle the voice of nature, and to the springs of religion to remove the qualms of conscience. It was on this occasion that he made use of Joseph du Tremblay, a Capuchin friar, as extraordinary a man in his way as Richelieu himself, an artful enthusiast, a knavish fanatic, one that was desirous at the same time to excite a crusade against the Turks, to found a religious order of the nuns of mount Calvary, to write verses, to negotiate in all the courts of Europe, and to raise himself to the purple and to the ministry. This man being admitted into one of those privy councils, which had been invented to do mischief without scruple of conscience, represented to the king that his majesty had a right, and that it was likewise his duty, to render his mother incapable of opposing the minister.

Feb. The court was then at Compiègne. The king set out
1631 from thence, and left his mother surrounded with guards, who deprived her of liberty. Her friends, dependents, domestics, and even her physician, were committed to the Bastile and to other prisons. The Bastile was always full during this whole administration. The marshal de Bassompierre, though only suspected of not being in the cardinal's interest, was confined there the remainder of that minister's life.

July, From that fatal moment Mary never more set sight
1631 of her son, nor of Paris, which she had embellished; that city being indebted to her for the Luxembourg palace, for those aqueducts which would have done honour to Rome, and for a public walk which is still called *the Queen's**. Ever the victim of her favourites, she passed the remainder of her days in a voluntary but painful exile. The dowager of Henry the Great, the mother of a king of France, the mother-in-law of three sovereigns, was sometimes in want of the necessaries

* *Cours de la Reine,*

of life. The foundation of all those quarrels was, that it was necessary that Louis XIII. should be governed by somebody; and he chose it should rather be by his minister than by his mother.

This queen, who for such a series of years had had the direction of the kingdom of France, repaired at first to Brussels: from that asylum she made application to her son, at the same time demanding justice of all the courts of judicature in the kingdom. She applied in suppliant terms to the parliament of Paris, whose remonstrances she had so often rejected, during her regency, having constantly treated it only as a court of judicature; such a change doth fortune produce in our manner of thinking. Her petition is still extant: "Mary queen of France and Navarre humbly sheweth, that ever since the 23d of February, she had been detained prisoner in the castle of Compiègne, without being either charged or suspected, &c." All her complaints against the cardinal lost their force by being too violent: besides, the persons who dictated them, mixed their own resentments with her sorrows, and false with true accusations: in a word, her lamentations only increased her misfortunes.

Notwithstanding the queen's petition against the minister, he obtained a patent of duke and peer, and was nominated governor of Britany. Every thing succeeded to his wishes in France, Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands. Julius Mazarin, the pope's agent in the affair of Mantua, rose to be a French minister by his skill in negotiation; and serving cardinal Richelieu, he laid, unknown to himself, the foundation of that fortune which destined him to succeed in the administration. An advantageous treaty had been lately concluded with the duke of Savoy, who ceded Pignerol in perpetuity to France.

Towards the Netherlands the prince of Orange, with the help of French money, made conquests upon the Spaniards; and the cardinal had secret correspondents even in Brussels.

In

In Germany, the extraordinary success of the arms of Gustavus-Adolphus, seemed to add lustre to the cardinal's services. In short, the uninterrupted prosperities of his administration held all his enemies in an incapacity of hurting him, while he gave a full scope to his vindictive resentment, which the welfare of the state seemed in some measure to authorize. He instituted a court of justice, where all the partisans of the king's mother and brother were condemned. The list of the proscribed was prodigious: every day new gibbets were to be seen, loaded with the effigies of men and women, who had followed the fortune, or been advisers of Gaston and the queen: inquiry was made even after physicians, and drawers of horoscopes, for saying that the king could not live long; two of whom were sent to the gallies. In a word, the queen-mother's effects, together with her jointure, were confiscated. "I am not willing to charge you," says she in a letter to her son, 1631 "with the seizure of my effects, nor with the making an inventory of them, as if I were dead; it is not at all credible that you would go to deprive her of nourishment, who gave you life."

The whole kingdom murmured; but hardly any body dared to speak. They who might be inclined to espouse the quarrel of the queen-mother, or of the duke of Orleans, were restrained by fear. The marshal duke of Montmorency, governor of Languedoc, was the only one that thought himself able to stop the cardinal's career: he flattered himself with the hopes of being the head of a party. But his courage, though great, was not a sufficient qualification for this dangerous task: he had not such an influence over his province as Lesdiguières had over Dauphiny: his extravagancies had put it out of his power to purchase a sufficient number of dependents; and his taste for pleasures would not permit him to apply himself intirely to business: in short, before he could be the head of a party, a party must be formed; which was not the case.

Gaston flattered him with the title of avenger of the royal family. His party depended on considerable success.

cour
fister
not
inva
flatt
ther
mar
or t
able
as h
the
sing
from
of t
hop
verf
libe
her
for
agai
prio
him
by f
that
sign
bod
T
mar
Ric
that
he
Loi
cou
agai
C
stro
with
was
he a
reno

cours from the duke of Lorraine, Charles IV. whose sister had been married to Gaston; but this duke was not able to defend himself against Louis XIII. who had invaded part of his dominions. The court of Spain flattered Gaston with the hopes of an army in the Netherlands, and towards Triers, with which he might march into France; but he could scarce assemble two or three thousand German horse, who, as he was not able to pay them, lived intirely upon plunder. As soon as he could shew himself in France with those succours, the whole kingdom was to join him; and yet not a single town stirred in his favour, upon his whole march, from the frontiers of Franche-Comtè to the provinces of the Loire, and as far as Languedoc. He was in hopes that the duke d'Epernon, who had formerly traversed the whole kingdom to set the queen-mother at liberty, who had waged war and concluded a peace in her favour, would now declare for the same queen, and for one of her sons, presumptive heir to the crown, against a minister whose pride had often mortified the pride of that same duke. This great resource also failed him. The duke d'Epernon had almost ruined himself by succouring the queen-mother: besides, he complained that she had neglected him, after he had done her such signal service. He hated the cardinal more than any body living, but he began to be afraid of him.

The prince of Condè, who had waged war against marshal d'Ancre, was not inclined to declare against Richelieu; but submitting to the superior genius of that minister, and eager to improve his private fortune, he solicited the command of the troops beyond the Loire, against his brother-in-law Montmorency. The count de Soissons had as yet only an impotent aversion against the cardinal, but durst not shew it.

Gaston being thus abandoned, because he was not strong enough, crossed the kingdom rather as a fugitive, with a gang of foreign banditti, than as a prince who was upon his march to give battle to a king. At length he arrived in Languedoc; where the duke of Montmorency had raised at his own expence, and by dint of promises,

promises, six or seven thousand men, which they called an army. Divisions, which ever mix in all parties, weakened Gaston's forces, as soon as assembled. His favorite, the duke d'Elbeuf, would fain share the command with the duke of Montmorency, who had the whole merit of raising the troops, and was in his own government.

Sept. 1. The affair of Castelnaudari began with reproaches betwixt Gaston and Montmorency. This could hardly
1632 be called a battle; it was a rencounter, a skirmish, in which the duke, in conjunction with a few lords of his party, attacked a small detachment of the royal army, commanded by marshal Schomberg. Whether it was through natural impetuosity, or through vexation and despair, or, in short, through excess of wine, a thing at that time very common, the duke leaped over a wide ditch, followed only by five or six persons. This was behaving like a knight-errant, but not as a general. Having made his way into the enemy's ranks, he was dangerously wounded, and taken within sight of Gaston and of his little army, who made not the least movement to assist him.

Gaston was not the only son of Henry IV. present at this engagement; the count de Moret, a bastard of this monarch and of mademoiselle de Beuil, ventured his person more than the legitimate son; he would not forsake the duke of Montmorency, but was killed by his side. It is this very count de Moret whom they afterwards brought to life, pretending that he lived a long time an hermit; an idle fable, interwoven with melancholy events.

No sooner was Montmorency taken prisoner, than Gaston grew disheartened, and the army which the duke had raised for him, was dispersed.

Then this prince was obliged to submit. The court sent Bullion, counsellor of state, and comptroller-general of the finances, to him, with a promise of pardon for Montmorency: yet the king did not stipulate this pardon in the treaty, or rather in the amnesty which he granted his brother. This is not acting nobly, to deceive

ceive the unfortunate and the weak; but the cardinal was determined to humble the king's brother, and to destroy Montmorency. Gaston went so far as to promise by an article of the treaty, "that he would love " cardinal Richelieu."

The fatal exit of the marshal duke of Montmorency is well known to all the world. His punishment was just, though that of the marshal of Marillac was not: yet the execution of a nobleman of such great expectations, who had gained so many victories, and whose signal bravery, generosity, and other agreeable accomplishments, had endeared him to all France, rendered the cardinal more odious than the death of Marillac had done. It is said, that when they were carrying the duke to prison, they found a bracelet on his arm, with queen Anne of Austria's picture; a particularity that has been constantly believed at court, and is agreeable to the spirit of the times. Madame de Motteville, a confidant of that queen, acknowledges in her Memoirs, that the duke of Montmorency had the same vanity as Buckingham, of being smitten with her charms: this was the *galeantear* of the Spaniards, something like the Italian *cicisbei*, a remnant of ancient chivalry; but which was not likely to sweeten the sour temper of Louis XIII. Montmorency, before he died, bequeathed a famous Oct. picture of Caracci's to the cardinal. This was not the 30, spirit of the times, but an unnatural sentiment, inspired 1632 at the approach of death, and considered by some as an act of Christian heroism, by others as imbecility.

The king's brother, finding that his return to France had brought his friend and defender to the scaffold; obliged to consider it as a favour that he was only banished from court; in a word, afraid of being deprived Nov. of his liberty, quitted the kingdom once more, and re- 15, tired to Brussels to keep his mother company. 1632

Under any other ministry, the flight of a queen, and of the presumptive heir of the crown, into an enemy's country, the general discontent of the several orders of the kingdom, the resentment of hundreds of families for the blood of their relations, all this together might

Nov. 16, 1632 have torn the kingdom in pieces; especially as the state of affairs in Europe was then greatly changed. Gustavus-Adolphus, the scourge of the house of Austria, was slain in the midst of his victory at Lutzen, in the neighbourhood of Leipstick; and the emperor, having got rid of this enemy, might, in conjunction with Spain, be able to overpower France. But, by extraordinary good fortune, the Swedes maintained themselves in a foreign country, notwithstanding the death of their chief. Germany was as much a scene of confusion and bloodshed as before; and Spain was daily growing weaker. The cardinal's power must therefore crush every cabal: and yet there was not a day without some new faction or intrigue. The minister himself occasioned them by private foibles, which insensibly intermix even with the most important affairs, and, in spite of all the artifices to conceal them, do not fail to disclose the mean condition of the great.

It is pretended that the duchess of Chevreuse, still possessed of beauty and wit sufficient to inspire the cardinal-minister with a tender passion, had succeeded in her attacks, and that she betrayed him to Chateauneuf the keeper of the seals. The commander de Jars, and others, were admitted into the secret. Queen Anne, wife of Louis XIII. had no other comfort, under the loss of her influence at court, than in assisting the duchess of Chevreuse to expose the cardinal to ridicule, since it was not in her power to destroy him. The duchess pretended to have a liking for the cardinal, and was forming intrigues in expectation of his death, which his bad state of health foreboded to be near. An opprobrious term, which this cabal made use of to distinguish the cardinal, was what offended him* the most of any thing.

The keeper of the seals was sent to prison without any form of process, because no process could be made. The commander de Jars, and others, being charged

* Queen Anne and the duchess used to call him, *cu pourri*, rotten a—e. V.

with

with having privately corresponded with the king's brother and mother, were condemned by commissioners to be beheaded. The commander had his pardon granted him upon the scaffold, but the others were executed.

Prosecutions were not only carried on against the king's subjects, who might chance to be accused of being in Gaston's interests; but even the duke of Lorraine, Charles IV. was a sufferer in the cause. Louis XIII. made himself master of Nancy his capital, which ¹⁶³³ he promised to restore, as soon as the duke delivered up his sister Margaret of Lorraine, who had been privately married to Gaston. This marriage was a fresh source of disputes and quarrels, both in church and state; and those disputes might some time or other produce a great revolution. The point regarded the succession to the crown; and since the question about the Salic law, never had there been a more important debate.

The king insisted that the marriage between his brother and Margaret of Lorraine should be annulled. Gaston had only a daughter by his first wife, the heiress of Montpensier. Now if the heir presumptive of the crown persisted in his second marriage, and a son should be born of it, the king wanted to have this son declared a bastard, and incapable of reigning.

This was an absolute violation of all religion, laws and customs; But as religion can only be instituted for the good of a state, it is certain, that when its customs are hurtful or dangerous, they ought to be abolished.

Gaston's marriage had been celebrated in the presence of witnesses, approved of by his wife's father, and by her whole family, consummated, acknowledged in court by the parties, and solemnly confirmed by the archbishop of Mechlin. The court of Rome, and all foreign universities, looked upon the marriage as valid and indissoluble; the university of Louvain went so far as to declare it was not in the pope's power to annul it, being an indelible sacrament.

The welfare of the state required that the princes of the blood should not have the power of disposing of their persons, without the king's permission; the same

reason might hereafter require, that the fruit of this marriage, now declared illegitimate, might be acknowledged the legitimate king of France. But this danger was remote, the present interest was pressing; and there seemed to be a necessity for determining, in spite of the church, that such a sacrament as marriage ought to be annulled, unless it was authorized by the previous consent of him who represents the father of the family.

A royal edict did what neither Rome nor the general councils would have done; and the king went attended by the cardinal to see this edict registered in the parliament of Paris. The cardinal spoke in this bed of justice as prime minister and peer of France. One may form a judgment of the eloquence of the times, by two or three passages of the cardinal's speech: he said, "That to convert a soul was more than to create a world; that the king durst not touch the queen his mother no more than the ark; and that there never happen above two or three relapses in acute disorders, unless the nobler parts are diseased." Almost the whole speech is in this stile; yet it was one of the best in those days. The prevailing bad taste did not diminish the minister's genius; for the spirit of government has been ever consistent with corrupt eloquence and false wit. Gaston's marriage was solemnly annulled; and the general assembly of the clergy in 1635, conforming to the edict, declared all the marriages of the princes of the blood null and void, unless they be contracted with the king's consent. Rome never approved of this law of the state and of the Gallican church.

The royal family was now reduced to a very hard dilemma. Should the presumptive heir of the crown persist in a marriage condemned in France, the issue of that marriage would be considered as bastards in that kingdom, and must have recourse to a civil war to inherit: were he to marry another wife, the issue of this second marriage would be looked upon as bastards at Rome, and must engage in a civil war against the children by the first venter. This perplexity was prevented by Gaston's steadiness; he never shewed any but upon this

occasion;

occasion; and the king, after some years, consented to acknowledge his sister-in-law; but the edict, which annuls the marriage of the princes of the blood without the king's consent, still continues in force.

The obstinacy of the cardinal in thus pursuing the king's brother even into his most inmost recesses, in depriving him of his wife, in stripping the duke of Lorraine, his brother-in-law, and in keeping the queen-mother in exile and in poverty, roused at length the adherents of those princes; and they entered into a plot to assassinate him. Chanteloupe, a father of the oratory and chaplain to Mary de Medicis, was accused in court of having suborned some ruffians to commit the murder, one of whom was broken on the wheel at Metz. Such wicked designs were very rare: there had been more conspiracies against the life of Henry IV: but even the most virulent enmities are productive of fewer barbarities than fanaticism.

The cardinal was better guarded than Henry IV. and therefore had nothing to fear. He was victorious over all his enemies. The court of queen Mary and her son Gaston, still wandering and destitute, was moreover torn by dissensions, the consequence of faction and misery.

Cardinal Richelieu had more potent enemies to combat. He was determined, notwithstanding the intestine troubles that divided the kingdom, to extend the glory and influence of France abroad, and to execute the grand project of Henry IV. by making open war against the house of Austria in Germany, Italy, and Spain. This war rendered him necessary to a master who did not love him, and in whose favour he was very often in danger of being undermined. His glory was concerned in the undertaking; and it seemed to be the proper season for overpowering the house of Austria in its decline. Picardy and Champagne were as yet the limits of France, which might be extended while the Swedes were still in the empire. The United Provinces were ready to attack the king of Spain in Flanders, if France would but lend them assistance. These were the only motives of the war against the emperor, which did not finish till the treaty

treaty of Westphalia; and of that against the king of Spain, which lasted a long time after, till the Pyrenean treaty. All the other motives were only pretexts.

The court of France hitherto, under the name of ally to Sweden, and mediator in the empire, had endeavour-
 Dec. ed to take advantage of the troubles of Germany. The
 6, Swedes had lost a great battle at Nordlingen; but this
 1635 very defeat proved advantageous to France, for it rendered them dependent on this crown. The chancellor Oxenstiern came to Compiègne to pay his court in person to the fortunate Cardinal, who from that time forward was arbiter of the affairs of Germany, which had been intirely in the hands of Oxenstiern. At the same time he concluded a treaty with the States-General, to share the Spanish Netherlands between them, reckoning they would be an easy conquest.

Louis XIII. sent a herald to Brussels to declare war. This herald was to present a challenge to the cardinal-infant, son of Philip III. and governor of the Netherlands. It is observable that this cardinal prince, according to the custom of the times, had commanded armies in person. He was one of the generals that beat the Swedes at Nordlingen. This century beheld three cardinals, Richelieu, de la Valette, and Sourdis, armed with a cuirass, and marching at the head of their troops. All these customs have changed. The sending of an herald to declare war, has never been practised since; princes are satisfied now with declaring war at home, without sending to notify it to the enemy.

The cardinal likewise drew the dukes of Savoy and Parma into this alliance: he took particular care to make sure of Bernard duke of Weimar, by granting him a yearly pension of four millions of livres, and promising him the landgraviate of Alsace. Not one event corresponded to the measures concerted. Alsace, which Weimar was to possess, fell long after into the hands of France; and Louis XIII. who in one campaign was to
 1636 share the Netherlands with the Dutch, lost his army, and was very near seeing all Picardy in the hands of the Spaniards. They had taken Corby; and count Galas, the
 the

the emperor's general, together with the duke of Lorraine, were already in the neighbourhood of Dijon. The arms of France were unsuccessful at first on every side: so that she was obliged to make great efforts, in order to resist those whom she thought to have subdued with ease.

In short, the cardinal was soon upon the brink of being ruined by that very war, in which he had engaged for his own and for his country's glory. The bad success of public affairs diminished for a while his power at court. Gaston, whose whole life had been a series of quarrels and reconciliations with the king his brother, returned to France; and the minister was obliged to intrust him and the count of Soissons with the command of the army, which retook Corby. He then saw him-¹⁶³⁶self exposed to the resentment of those two princes. This was the time, as we have already observed, of conspiracies as well as duels. The same persons, who afterwards, in conjunction with cardinal de Retz, raised the first disturbance in the minority of Louis XIV. and who were concerned in the affair of the *Barricades*, embraced even then every opportunity of exercising that spirit of faction which was inwardly devouring them. Gaston and the count of Soissons consented to every thing that could be done to destroy the cardinal. A resolution was taken to make away with him in the king's apartment; but the duke of Orleans, who never did any thing but by halves, being frightened at the thoughts of the attempt, neglected to give the signal which the conspirators had agreed to.

The Imperialists were driven out of Burgundy, and the Spaniards out of Picardy: the duke of Weimar carried his point in Alsace, and made himself master of very nigh all that landgraviate, which had been guaranteed to him by France. At length, after more successes than disappointments, the same fortune which had saved the cardinal's life from so many conspiracies, preserved also his glory, which depended on success.

This love of glory made him covet the empire of letters and wit, even at the very crisis we have been speaking

ing of, and amidst the plots that were continually brooding
 1637 against his person. At this same period he erected the French academy, and exhibited in his palace a few theatrical pieces, in which he had some hand himself. He resumed his haughty air as soon as the danger was over. For it was at this same time, that he fomented the disturbances in England, when he wrote to the count d'Estades, this little note, the forerunner of Charles I's misfortunes; "The king of England shall see, before a
 " year is at an end, that he must not despise me."

1638 When the prince of Condè was obliged to raise the siege of Fontarabia, where his army was defeated, and the duke de la Valette was accused of having neglected to assist him, the cardinal ordered Valette, who had fled the kingdom, to be tried by commissioners, where the king himself presided in person. This was the ancient usage of trial by peerage, when the kings were considered only as heads of the peers; but under a government purely monarchical, the presence and vote of the sovereign must have too great an influence on the opinion of the judges.

This war, of the cardinal's stirring up, did not succeed to his wishes, till the duke of Weimar gained at
 1638 length a complete victory, making four of the Imperial general's prisoners, and settled himself in Friburg and Brisac; and till the Spanish branch of the house of Austria was stripped of Portugal by the only conspiracy in those days that proved successful, and at length was dispossessed also of Catalonia by an open rebellion towards the end of 1640. But before fortune had thus disposed of all these extraordinary events in favour of France, the kingdom was in danger of being ruined. The troops began to be ill paid; and Grotius, the Swedish ambassador at Paris, says, that the revenue
 1636 was ill administered. He had reason to say so; for the cardinal had been obliged, some time after the battle of Corby, to create four and twenty new counsellors of parliament, and one president. It is very certain there was no want of judges; and it was a shame to make new ones merely to get a little money by the sale of
 I their

their employments. The parliament complained of this step. All the answer the cardinal made, was to imprison five magistrates who had spoken to him like free-born subjects. Whoever opposed his will, either at court, or in parliament, or in the army, was sure to be disgraced, exiled, or imprisoned.

It is a circumstance, not very worthy of attention, that there should be only twenty persons found to purchase these judges seats: but what will serve to shew us the spirit of mankind, and especially of Frenchmen, is, that the new created members were a long time despised and hated by the whole body; that in the war of the league, they were obliged to pay fifteen thousand livres each, to obtain the good graces of their brethren, by contributions to a war against the government. This, as we shall see hereafter, got them the name of the *Quinze-vingt*, or the twenty fiftens. It is likewise observable, that when an attempt was made lately to lay aside these useless members, the parliament, who had cried out against their being first introduced, as mere supernumeraries, exclaimed as loudly against their being suppressed. Thus are the same things well or ill received, according to the spirit of the times, and the remedy is frequently as much complained of as the disease.

Louis XIII. had ever occasion for a favourite, to divert his melancholy, or to listen to his complaints. This post was filled by the duke of St. Simon; who, happening not to carry himself well with the cardinal, was removed from court, and banished to Blayes.

The king sometimes took a liking to the ladies. He was fond of Mademoiselle de la Fayette, maid of honour to the queen-consort; as far as a weak man, disturbed with scruples, and not over voluptuous, can be fond. The Jesuit Caussin, the king's confessor, favoured this connexion, which might contribute to the queen-mother's recall. While Mademoiselle de la Fayette permitted the king to make love to her, she was in the interest of the two queens against the cardinal: but the minister got the better both of the mistress and of the

confessor, as before he had got the better of the two queens. Mademoiselle was frightened out of her wits, and obliged to throw herself into a convent; and soon after father Caussin was seized, and banished into lower Brittany.

This same Jesuit advised Louis XIII. to put the kingdom under the protection of the Virgin Mary, in order to sanctify the king's amours with Mademoiselle de la Fayette, which was looked upon only as a union of minds in which the senses had but very little share. The Jesuit's advice was followed, and cardinal Richelieu put this project in practice the following year, while Caussin celebrated, in wretched doggrel, at Quimpercorentin, the particular regard the Holy Virgin had for the kingdom of France. The house of Austria happened to have the Virgin for its patroness likewise; so that our holy lady must have been extremely put to it, which of them to have served, had it not been that the Swedes and the duke of Weimar were protestants.

Christina, duchess of Savoy, daughter of Henry IV. widow of Louis Amadeus, and regent of Savoy, had also a Jesuit for her confessor, who was caballing at that court, and prepossessing his penitent against cardinal Richelieu. This minister, preferring his own revenge and the interest of the state to the law of nations, did not hesitate a single moment about seizing the person of the Jesuit in the duchess's dominions. (Observe, that you will never meet with any great troubles in history, nor any court intrigues, without the confessors of kings having an hand in them, which often ends in their own disgrace. For instance, a prince has the weakness to consult his confessor in state affairs, (and by the bye, this is one of the greatest inconveniencies attending auricular confession.) The confessor who is almost always of some one party, endeavours to make his royal penitent consider the views of his party as the will of God. The minister soon comes to a knowledge of these artifices; upon which the confessor is disgraced, and another is taken in his place, who practises the very same.)

Cabals

Cabals and intrigues still continued at court. The queen, Anne of Spain, whom we commonly call Anne of Austria, was treated as a criminal, only for writing to the duchess of Chevreuse, the cardinal's enemy, and a fugitive. Her papers were seized, and she underwent an interrogatory before the chancellor Seguier.

All these passages, drawn into one view, form the picture of this administration. It seemed as if the same man was destined to domineer over the whole family of Henry IV. to persecute his widow abroad, to abuse his son Gaston at home, to raise factions against his daughter the queen of England, to lord it over the duchess of Savoy his other daughter, to strike a terror into his wife; and, in a word, to humble Louis XIII. by rendering him powerful, and to ill treat his wife, the reigning queen.

Thus the whole time of his administration was spent in making himself odious, and in taking his revenge; whilst almost every year was productive of rebellions and executions. The revolt of the count of Soissons proved the most dangerous: it was supported by the duke of Bouillon, the marshal's son, who entertained him at Sedan; by the duke of Guise, grandson of him who was called the *Scarred*, and who, with the courage of his ancestors, was willing to revive their reputation; and last of all by the king of Spain, who supplied them with money, and with troops from the Netherlands. This was not a rash attempt like those of Gaston.

The count of Soissons and the duke of Bouillon had a good army, and knew how to command it: for their greater security, while this army advanced, it was agreed to assassinate the cardinal, and to raise an insurrection in Paris. The cardinal of Retz, then very young, served his political noviciate in this conspiracy. The battle of Marfée, which the count of Soissons gained in 1641 in the neighbourhood of Sedan over the king's troops, could not fail to encourage the conspirators. But the cardinal escaped from this danger likewise, by the death of that prince, who was killed in the engagement.

This was the only time he had it not in his power to punish. He knew nothing of the conspiracy against his life; and the rebel army was victorious. He was obliged to enter into a negotiation with the duke of Bouillon, who was in possession of Sedan. The duke of Guise alone, the same who afterwards made himself master of Naples, was out-lawed by the parliament of Paris.

The duke of Bouillon, being taken into favour at court, and in appearance reconciled to the cardinal, renewed his oath of allegiance, at the same time that he was contriving a fresh conspiracy. As all who came near the king hated the minister, and as the king had ever occasion for a favourite, Richelieu himself recommended young d'Esfiat Cinq-Mars to him, that he might have a creature of his own near his majesty's person. This youth, having been soon preferred to the post of master of the horse, would fain be a member of the council; but the cardinal opposing it, Cinq-Mars became his implacable enemy. What emboldened him most to enter into a conspiracy, was the king himself. Frequently dissatisfied with his minister, with his pride, his state, and even his merit, he used to confide his chagrins to his favourite, whom he stiled *his dear friend*; and on these occasions he was too apt to speak of Richelieu with such acrimony, as encouraged Cinq-Mars more than once to propose assassinating him; which is proved by a letter from Louis XIII. to the chancellor Seguier. But this very prince took afterwards such a dislike to his favourite, that he oftentimes banished him from his presence; so that Cinq-Mars soon began to have an equal aversion both to Louis XIII. and to Richelieu. He had already established a correspondence with the count of Soissons, which he continued with the duke of Bouillon; when the king's brother, who since his repeated miscarriages, had lived upon his estate at Blois, tired at length of an indolent life, and solicited by his confidants, thought proper to join in the conspiracy. The basis of every plot was the death of the minister, a project often formed, but never executed.

Louis

Louis XIII. and cardinal Richelieu, both labouring 1642 under a disorder more dangerous than these conspiracies, and which soon laid them in their graves, were upon their march to Roussillon, with an intent to wrest this province intirely from the house of Austria. The duke of Bouillon, who should not have been intrusted with an army just after he had been fighting against the king, had the command nevertheless of a body of troops in Piedmont against the Spaniards; and at this very time he was plotting with Cinq-Mars and the king's brother. The conspirators were concluding a treaty with the duke d'Olivarez, to introduce a Spanish army into France, and to throw every thing into confusion, under a regency which was thought to be at hand, and of which every body expected to make his advantage. Cinq-Mars was at that time with the king at Narbonne, and was more in his good graces than ever; while Richelieu lay sick at Tarascon, deprived of the royal favour, with this advantage only left, that his service was necessary to his majesty.

The cardinal's good fortune would have it, that this 1642 plot was likewise discovered, and a copy of the treaty fell into his hands. It cost Cinq-Mars his life. It is an anecdote transmitted down by the courtiers of that time, that the king, who used to call the master of the horse, "Dear friend," took his watch out of his pocket at the time appointed for the execution, saying, "I believe *dear friend* at present cuts but a sad figure." The duke of Bouillon was put under arrest in the midst of his army at Casal. He saved his life, because the government wanted the principality of Sedan more than his blood. He who had twice betrayed the state, preserved his princely dignity, and in exchange for Sedan, had lands given him, that produced him a better revenue. M. de Thou, who could be charged only with being privy to the conspiracy, which he had disapproved of, was condemned to death for not disclosing it. In vain did he represent that it was not in his power to prove his deposition, and that if he had accused the king's brother of high-treason, without

without juridical proofs, he should have been much more deserving of death. So clear a justification was not admitted by the cardinal his personal enemy. The judges condemned him, in consequence of a law of Louis XI. whose very name is a sufficient proof of its cruelty. The queen herself had been in the secret; but as she was not accused, her majesty escaped the mortification she must have otherwise undergone. As for Gaston duke of Orleans, he informed against his accomplices according to custom, made an humble submission, consented to stay at Blois without guards or honours; while it was ever his fate to bring his friends either to a prison or to the scaffold.

The cardinal, indulging his revenge under the sanction of justice, acted on this occasion with the utmost arrogance and severity. The master of the horse was dragged after his train from Tarascon to Lyons upon the Rhone, on board a vessel fastened to the cardinal's, who, though struck himself with death, was leading a man in triumph, as it were, to the place of execution. From thence the cardinal proceeded to Paris, carried by his guards on their shoulders, in a furnished apartment, in which two men might stand by his bedside: the guards were frequently relieved upon their march; and the town walls, wherever he came, were broke
 Dec. down to give him more convenient admittance. In
 4, this equipage he went to breathe his last at Paris at
 1642 fifty-eight years of age, leaving the king pleased to
 lose him, and embarrassed at being his own master.

This minister is said to have reigned after his decease, because some vacant places, which he had nominated to, were filled up: but the warrants were signed before he died. A proof, beyond all contradiction, that he reigned too long, and that his government had expired, was, that all those whom he had imprisoned in the Bastille, were set at liberty, as victims untied, and no longer to be sacrificed to his vindictive disposition. He bequeathed three millions of livres to the king, of our present money, at fifty livres the mark, a sum which he had always kept in reserve. The expence of his
 3 household,

household, since he had been prime minister, amounted to a thousand crowns a day. His palace was remarkable for magnificence; and the king's for simplicity. When he waited upon his sovereign, his guards went up to the very door of the apartment. In all places he took precedence of the princes of the blood: in short, he wanted nothing but the crown. Even when he was in a dying condition, he flattered himself he should outlive the king, and was concerting measures to render himself regent. The widow of Henry IV. was May gone five months before him; and he was followed 13, five months after by Louis XIII. 1643

It is difficult to say which of the three was the most July unhappy. The queen-mother had lived long an exile, 3, and died a beggar at Cologne. The son, master of a 1641 fine kingdom, neither tasted the pleasures, if there be any, of grandeur, nor those of humanity; ever subject to the yoke of his minister, though desirous to shake it off; infirm, melancholy, gloomy, insupportable to himself, not having so much as a servant that loved him, mistrusting his wife, hated by his brother, forsaken by his mistresses without knowing what love is, betrayed by his favourites, abandoned on the throne, almost alone in the midst of a court who were impatiently waiting for his death, who were incessantly foretelling it, and who considered him as incapable of raising an heir to the crown: so that the life of the meanest citizen, who lived quietly in his family, was far preferable to his.

Cardinal Richelieu was perhaps the most miserable of the three, because the most detested; and, though in a very bad state of health, he was obliged to bear an immense burden, his hands all the time imbrued in blood.

At this very period of plots and executions, the kingdom flourished; and, notwithstanding so many public afflictions, the age of the polite arts began to dawn. Louis XIII. did not contribute in the least, but the cardinal contributed greatly, to this change. Philosophy,

sophy, it is true, could not shake off its scholastic rust; but Corneille's *Cid*, which was written in 1636, may be said to have begun the age distinguished by the name of Louis XIV. Poussin equalled Raphael in some branches of painting. Sculpture was soon brought to perfection by Girardon: of this the mausoleum of cardinal Richelieu is a lasting proof. The French began to distinguish themselves for the graces and ornaments of the mind. This was properly the dawn of good taste.

The nation was not yet what it afterwards became; nor was trade properly encouraged, nor the general police established. The internal order of the kingdom was still to be settled. There were no fine towns except Paris, which still wanted a great many necessaries, as may be seen in the *Age of Louis XIV.* Their manner of living was as different from ours, as their mode of dress. Were we to see the people of those days, we should hardly think they were the preceding generation. The buskins, the doublet, the cloak, the large ruff, the whiskers, and the sharp pointed beard, made as great a difference between them and us, as their passion for plotting, their madness for duelling, their carousing in public houses, and their general ignorance, notwithstanding their natural good sense.

The nation was not as rich as it has been since, in specie, and in plate: and indeed the ministry, who raised all they could upon the people, had scarce more than the moiety of the revenue of Louis XIV. They were still inferior to us in industry. The coarse fabrics of cloth at Rouen and Elbeuf, were the finest we had in France. There was no tapestry, no crystal, no manufactures of glass. Watchmaking was in an imperfect state, for it consisted only in putting a string to the fusee of a watch; and pendulums were not yet invented. The trade to the staples of the Levant was ten times less than what it is at present; that of America was confined to the furs of Canada; not a single ship was sent to the East-Indies, while the Dutch were possessed

of kingdoms in that part of the world, and the English of considerable settlements.

Hence the nation was possessed of less money than it has had since; and the government borrowed at higher interest: the least it gave in the way of annuities, was seven and a half per cent. at the death of cardinal Richelieu. From thence we may derive an invincible proof, among many others, that the *Testament* attributed to that minister was not written by him. The ignorant and absurd blunderer, who assumed his name, says in the first chapter of the second part, that the enjoyment of those annuities produceth the entire reimbursement of the capital in seven years and a half: he has mistaken the seventh denier, for seven and a half per cent. and he did not see that the reimbursement of a capital, in seven years and a half, does not produce seven and a half per annum, but very near fourteen. This whole chapter shews the author to be as little acquainted with the first elements of arithmetic, as with those of politics. I have entered into this detail, only to shew how greatly mankind are imposed upon by names: so long as this mysterious performance passed for cardinal Richelieu's, it was extolled to the skies as a masterpiece: but when it came to be observed how full it is of errors in chronology and topography, false computations, and the most absurd and ignorant assertions, such as, for instance, that France had a greater number of ports in the Mediterranean than Spain; in a word when it was perceived, that in all this pretended political testament of cardinal Richelieu, there was not the least mention made, of the manner in which it was proper to carry on the war, in which the French monarchy was engaged at that time; this famous work became as much despised as it was before admired.

C H A P. CLXXVII.

Of the Government and Manners of Spain, from Philip II. to Charles II.

WE find that after the death of Philip II. the Spanish monarchs strengthened their authority at home, while they insensibly lost their weight and influence in the rest of Europe. This decline may be dated so early as the first years of the reign of Philip III. the weakness of whose disposition was visible in every part of his government. It was difficult indeed to have a watchful eye over America, and over such vast possessions in Asia, Africa, Italy and the Low Countries: but his father had overcome these difficulties; and surely no task could be too arduous for a monarch possessed of the treasures of Mexico, Peru, Brasil and the East-Indies. But so great was the neglect and corruption in the administration of the revenue, under his reign, that during the war which still continued with the United Provinces, the Spanish government had not money to pay their troops; for which reason they mutinied, and three thousand of them deserted to prince
 1604 Maurice. Thus a simple stadtholder acting with œconomy, paid his forces much better than the sovereign of so many kingdoms. Philip III. might have covered the sea with ships; and yet the petty provinces of
 1606 Holland and Zealand had greater fleets than he: they stripped him of the chief of the Molucca islands, and especially of Amboyna, which produces the most costly spices, and of which they have ever since continued in possession. In a word, those seven little provinces baffled the land forces of that vast monarchy; and were far more powerful by sea.

Philip III. though at peace with France, and with England, and having no war but with this infant republic,
 1609 lic, was obliged to conclude a truce for twelve years, to leave her in possession of whatever she had acquired, to promise her a free trade to the East Indies, in fine,

to

to restore the house of Nassau to its estates situated within the dominions of the Spanish monarchy. Henry IV. had the glory of concluding this treaty by means of his ambassadors. It is generally the weakest side that desires a truce; here prince Maurice was against it. There was more difficulty in making him agree to this treaty, than the king of Spain.

The expulsion of the Moors was infinitely of greater ¹⁶⁰⁹ prejudice to the Spanish monarchy. Philip III. could not subdue a handful of Dutchmen; yet unfortunately he was able to drive six or seven hundred thousand Moors out of his dominions. Those remains of the ancient conquerors of Spain were mostly disarmed: being employed in commerce and agriculture, they were less formidable than the protestants in France, and far from useful, because they were industrious in a country of indolence. Though obliged to pretend to Christianity, they were continually persecuted by the Inquisition: this persecution occasioned some insurrections, but of no consequence, and such as were soon quelled. Henry IV. wanted to take these people under his ¹⁶⁰⁹ protection: but his correspondence with them was discovered by the treachery of a clerk in the secretary of state's office; an accident which hastened their expulsion. The court had already determined to get rid of them. In vain did they propose to pay two millions of ducats for their liberty of breathing Spanish air; the council was inflexible: twenty thousand of the proscribed took shelter in the mountains, but having no arms, they were soon obliged to submit. Two whole years were spent in transporting the natives of Spain, and in depopulating the state. Thus did Philip deprive himself of the most industrious part of his subjects, instead of imitating the Turks, who keep the Greeks in subjection, without forcing them to look out for distant settlements.

The greatest part of those Spanish Moors took shelter in Africa their antient country; some went into France under the regency of Mary de Medicis; those who would not renounce their religion, took shipping in France for Tunis; a few families, that made profession

of Christianity, settled in Provence, and Languedoc; some went as far as Paris, where there are still several of their descendants. At length those fugitives incorporated with a nation, that has profited by the mistake of Spain, though she afterwards imitated this example in the expulsion of the Protestants. Thus it is that all nations are mingled, and absorbed one within the other, sometimes by persecutions, and at other times by conquests.

This great emigration, together with that of the colonies which avarice had transplanted to the new world, insensibly exhausted Spain of inhabitants; so that in a short time it was nothing more than a vast body without substance. Superstition, that distemper of impotent minds, proved a further disgrace to the reign of Philip III; while his court was only a chaos of intrigues, like that of Louis XIII. Neither of those princes could live without favourites, nor reign without prime ministers. The duke of Lerma, who was afterwards cardinal, governed the king and kingdom a long time: but the confusion, in which every thing was involved, drove him from his place. He was succeeded by his son; but without any advantage to Spain.

Under Philip IV. son of Philip III. the disorder increased. His favourite the count-duke d'Olivarez made him take the title of *Great* at his succession to the crown: had he deserved it, he would not have had a prime minister. Europe and his subjects refused to give him this title; but after he had lost Roussillon by the weakness of his arms, Portugal by neglect, and Catalonia by abuse of power, the public voice gave him for his device a ditch with these words, "the more you dig out of it, the greater it is."

This fine kingdom was at that time impotent abroad, and miserable at home. The Spaniards were strangers to all sort of police. The inland trade was ruined by the duties, which were continued to be raised, from one province to another. Each of those provinces having been formerly a petty kingdom, the ancient customs still subsisted; and what had been heretofore a
necessary

necessary law, was now become a heavy abuse. They knew not how to mould all those different parts of the kingdom, into a regular whole. The same abuse had been introduced into France; but in Spain they carried it to such excess, that no body was permitted to transport money into a different province. The inhabitants of that happy climate were strangers to industry, so that they seldom improved the blessings of nature: neither the raw silk of Valentia, nor the excellent wood of Andalusia and Castile, were worked up by Spanish hands: fine linen was a luxury very little known: the Flemish manufactures, one of the establishments of the house of Burgundy, supplied Madrid with all the magnificence known in those days: gold and silver stuffs were prohibited throughout the kingdom; as if it had been a petty republic that was afraid of being impoverished. Upon the whole, notwithstanding the mines of the new world, Spain was so exhausted, that the ministry under Philip IV. found themselves reduced to the necessity of making money of copper, on which they set almost as high a value as on silver: and the sovereign of Mexico and Peru was obliged to coin false money in order to defray the expences of the state. They did not dare, if we may believe the judicious Gourville, to lay personal taxes, because the citizens, and the country people, having hardly any moveables, could never be forced to pay. Never was that saying of Charles V. found so true: "In France there is plenty of every thing, in Spain every thing is wanting."

The reign of Philip IV. was one continued series of miscarriages and defeats: and the count-duke d'Olivera proved as unsuccessful in his administration, as cardinal Richelieu had been fortunate in his.

The Dutch at the expiration of the twelve years truce, renewed the war, and took Brasil, where they still keep ¹⁶²⁵ possession of Surinam: they likewise made themselves masters of Maestricht, which has also continued in their hands. Philip's troops were driven out of the Valteline and Piedmont by the French, without any declaration of war; and when war was declared in 1635, the king of

of Spain proved unsuccessful on all sides. The province
 1639 of Artois was invaded. Catalonia jealous of her privi-
 1640 leges, which were trampled upon, revolted and threw
 1641 herself into the arms of France. Portugal shook off the
 yoke; and a conspiracy, well planned and well executed,
 placed the house of Braganza on the throne. The
 prime minister Olivarez had the mortification of contri-
 buting to this great revolution, by sending money to
 the duke of Braganza, to prevent any excuse that prince
 might make for not repairing to Madrid. This very
 money served to reward the conspirators.

The revolution was no way difficult. Olivarez had had
 the imprudence to withdraw the Spanish garrison from
 Lisbon. There were but few troops to guard the king-
 dom. The people were enraged at some new tax; and
 in short the prime minister, thinking to deceive the
 duke of Braganza, had given him the command of the
 army. The duchess of Mantua, vice-queen of Portu-
 gal, was expelled, and nobody undertook to support
 Dec. her. A Spanish secretary of state, and one of his clerks,
 11, were the only victims offered up to the public vengeance.
 1640 All the towns throughout Portugal followed the exam-
 ple of Lisbon almost the same day. John of Braganza
 was every where proclaimed king without the least
 disturbance: never did son succeed more peaceably to
 his father. Vessels were dispatched from Lisbon to the
 several towns in Asia and Africa, and to the islands be-
 longing to the crown of Portugal: not one of them he-
 sitated to drive away their Spanish governors. The re-
 maining part of Brasil, namely, whatever had not been
 wrested from the Spaniards by the Dutch, returning to
 the Portuguese; and at length the Dutch, entering into
 an alliance with the new king don John of Braganza,
 restored the other part to the crown of Portugal.

The Azores, Masambique, Goa, Macao, were ani-
 mated with the same spirit as Lisbon. One would
 have imagined that the plan of this conspiracy had been
 laid in each of those places. Upon the whole it plainly
 appeared that a foreign administration is ever odious,
 and

and that the Spanish ministry had taken but little care to preserve their extensive dominions.

These transactions afforded an instance of the flattery paid to kings in their misfortunes, and of the disguise with which they are informed of unprosperous events. The manner in which Olivarez disclosed the loss of Portugal to Philip IV. is well-known. "I am come," said he to bring your majesty good news: you have gained the duke of Braganza's whole fortune; he has taken it into his head to be proclaimed king; and of course, his estates are confiscated to the crown." The confiscation, however, did not take place: Portugal rose to be a very considerable kingdom, especially as soon as the riches of Brasil began to procure her a commerce, which would have been advantageous, if a love of labour could have been able to animate the industry of the Portuguese.

The count-duke d'Olivarez, who had been so long master of the Spanish monarchy, and the rival of cardinal Richelieu, was at length disgraced for being unsuccessful. These ministers had long reigned like kings, one in France, the other in Spain; both had the enmity of the royal family, of the grandees, and the people; they were very different in their characters, in their virtues, and in their vices; the count-duke being as reserved, tranquil and mild, as the cardinal was lively, arrogant and cruel. What kept Richelieu in the ministry, and almost generally gave him the ascendant over Olivarez, was his activity. The Spanish minister lost every thing by his indolence: he died the death of discarded ministers, who are said to pine away with chagrin, occasioned not only by solitude after the busy scenes of life, but by a consciousness of having incurred the popular hatred, without a capacity of taking their revenge. Cardinal Richelieu had shortened his days in another manner, by the anxiety which devoured him even in the height of his power.

After all the losses that the Spanish branch of the house of Austria had sustained, still it had more dominions left, than Spain is possessed of at present. The
Milanese

Milanese, Flanders, Naples and Sicily, belonged to that monarchy ; and notwithstanding the weakness of its government, it gave a great deal of trouble to France, till the Pyrenean treaty.

Spain has suffered so great a depopulation, that don Ustario, a celebrated statesman who wrote in 1723, for the good of his country, reckons the number of inhabitants at that time, not to amount to more than seven millions, which is somewhat less than two-fifths of what there are in France ; and while he laments the great decrease of useful subjects, he at the same time complains, that the number of monks in the kingdom had almost always continued the same. He also confesses that the revenues of the kings of Spain, though masters of the mines of Mexico and Peru, did not amount, to eighty millions of livres* of the present money.

The Spaniards, from the time of Philip II. to Philip IV. distinguished themselves as men of genius. Their theatre, though imperfect, was preferable to that of other countries, and served as a model to the English : even when tragedy began afterwards to appear in France with some dignity, it was greatly indebted to the Spanish stage. History, agreeable romances, ingenious fictions and morals, were treated in Spain with greater success than the drama ; but they have been ever strangers to sound philosophy. The errors of the schools have been perpetuated by the inquisition and superstition ; the mathematics have been very little minded ; and in all their wars they have generally employed Italian engineers. They have had some painters of the second rank, but never a school of painting. Architecture never made any great progress among them. The Escorial was built after the designs of a Frenchman. The mechanic arts were all in a very rude state. The magnificence of the grandees consisted in a large collection of plate, and a great number of domestics. They had a generous ostentation which was

* Somewhat less than three millions and a half sterling. T.
greatly

greatly taking with foreigners, and obtained no where but in Spain; this was to divide the money they won at play, among the standers by, of what condition soever. Montresor relates, that when the duke of Lerma received Gaston, brother of Louis XIII. with all his retinue in the Netherlands, he displayed a magnificence of a still more extraordinary kind. This prime minister, with whom Gaston staid several days, used to put two thousand louis-d'ors upon a large gaming table, after they had finished their repast. With this money, Gaston's attendants, and even that prince himself, sat down to play.

The entertainments of bull fighting were very frequent, as they are to this day; and indeed this was a most magnificent, most gallant, as well as dangerous spectacle. All this while they were strangers to every conveniency of life. The want of those conveniences had increased since the expulsion of the Moors. Hence it is that you travel through Spain, as through the deserts of Arabia, and that you meet with few accommodations even in the great towns. Neither was society more improved than the mechanic arts. The Spanish women were almost as much confined, as those of Africa; and if ever they compared this slavery to French liberty, it only made them more unhappy. This constraint had perfected an art to which we are strangers, that of speaking by signs: in this manner did the lover disclose his passion under his mistress's window; and she immediately opened the lattice, to answer him in the same language. Every body played upon the guitar; and yet every Spanish face was overcast with melancholy. Practices of religion served those indolent people instead of business. Then it was said that pride, devotion, love, and idleness formed the characteristic of the Spanish nation. But they had none of those bloody revolutions, none of those conspiracies, or cruel executions, which were exhibited at the other courts of Europe. Neither the duke of Lerma, nor the count-duke d'Olivarez, spilled the blood of their enemies upon a scaffold: their kings were not
VOL. IV. *Gen. Hist.* Q assassinated

assassinated as in France; nor did they die as in England, by the hands of a public executioner. In short, were it not for the horrors of the inquisition, there would be nothing to reproach Spain with at that time.

After the death of Philip IV. which happened in 1666, Spain was very unfortunate. Mary of Austria, widow to the deceased king, and sister to the emperor Leopold, was regent during the minority of don Carlos, or Charles II. his son. Her regency was not so distracted as that of Anne of Austria, in France; but they had this melancholy conformity with each other, that the queen of Spain drew upon her the hatred of the whole nation, by giving the administration into the hands of a foreign priest, as the queen of France made all her people her enemies, by subjecting them to the yoke of an Italian cardinal; the principal grandees opposed the ministers in both states, and the interior government was equally ill conducted in the one as in the other.

The prime minister, who governed the Spanish nation for some time, during the minority of don Carlos, or Charles II. was the Jesuit Everard Nitard, a German by birth, confessor to the queen, and grand inquisitor of the kingdom. The incompatibility which religion seems to have placed between the monastic vow, and ministerial intrigues, soon raised a general murmur against this Jesuit.

The character of Nitard did not a little add to the public indignation against him. Though he was very capable of ruling over the mind of his penitent, he was by no means fit to hold the reins of government in a state, having nothing of the minister or the priest, but pride and ambition, even without the necessary covering of dissimulation. He one day had the insolence to say to the duke of Lerma, even before he was in administration, "It is you who owe respect to me, who have every day your God in my hands, and your queen at my feet," with this pride, so opposite to true greatness, he suffered the treasury to be left bare of money, all the strong places in the kingdom to fall to ruin, the

the ports to be left without shipping, and the troops without discipline, or leaders capable of commanding them; this negligence of his, more especially, contributed to the first advantages which Louis XIV. gained over his brother-in-law, and his mother-in-law, when he attacked them in 1667, and took from them one half of Flanders, and one half of Franche-Comté.

A party was formed against the Jesuit minister, as in France against cardinal Mazarine; and Nitard found in don John of Austria, natural son of Philip IV. as implacable an enemy as the great Condé was to the cardinal. Condé was imprisoned, don John was banished. These disputes gave rise to two factions that divided the Spanish nation, but without a civil war, which, however, was just on the point of breaking out, when the queen prevented it by banishing father Nitard, (though much against her will,) in the same manner as queen Anne of Austria was obliged to turn off Mazarine. But this latter returned more powerful than ever; whereas father Nitard, who was dismissed in 1669, could never again set footing in Spain. The reason was, that the queen regent had taken another confessor in his room, who opposed the return of his predecessor; whereas the queen of France had no minister near her to supply the place of Mazarine.

Nitard went to Rome, where he in vain solicited a cardinal's hat, which is seldom bestowed on disgraced ministers, and was obliged to live a retired life, very little countenanced by his brethren, who indeed are seldom fond of a person who has raised himself above their level. But at length, by his own intrigues and the good offices of the queen of Spain, he obtained this dignity of cardinal, which is so much the darling object of all church-men; and from that moment his brother Jesuits courted his favour.

The reign of Charles II. of Spain, was as weak as that of Philip III. and Philip IV. as you will see in the *Age of Louis XIV.*

C H A P. CLXXVIII.

Of the Germans under Rodolphus II. Matthias, and Ferdinand II.—Of the Misfortunes of Frederick, Elector Palatine.—Of the Conquests of Gustavus Adolphus.—Peace of Westphalia, &c.

WHILE France was resuming new vigour under Henry IV. while England was flourishing under Elizabeth, and while Spain was the preponderating power in Europe under Philip II. Germany and the North were far from making so great a figure.

If we consider Germany as the seat of the empire, this was only an empty name; for it may be observed, that since the abdication of Charles V. till the reign of Leopold, it had no sort of influence in Italy. The coronations at Rome and Milan were suppressed as useless ceremonies, though they had been considered as essential: but since the reign of Ferdinand I. brother and successor to Charles V. the emperors neglected the journey to Rome. The pretensions of those princes to that capital, and those of the popes to confer the Imperial dignity, were insensibly fallen into oblivion; and reduced to a letter of congratulation, which the supreme pontiff writes to the emperor elect. Germany continued to enjoy the title of empire, though weak and divided. It was a republic of princes over whom presided the emperor; and those princes having constant pretensions one against the other, generally maintained a civil war, either openly or underhand, fomented by opposite interests, and by the three religions of the empire, which were more difficult to reconcile than the interests of princes. It was impossible that this country, divided into so many principalities, without commerce, or wealth, should greatly influence the system of Europe. It had no weight or strength abroad, but was strong at home, because the inhabitants were always industrious and warlike. Had the Germanic constitution been ever subverted, had the Turks seized part of Germany,

Germany, and the other invited foreign masters, politicians would have said, that the empire, already rent by its divisions, could not possibly subsist: they would have demonstrated, that the extraordinary form of its government, the multitude of princes, and the plurality of religions, must ever be productive of ruin and slavery. The causes of the decline of the ancient Roman empire were far from being so obvious. Yet the Germanic body hath remained unshaken, though it has within its bosom what seems to menace its ruin; and it is difficult to attribute this stability of so complicated a constitution, to any other cause than to the genius of the people.

Germany had lost Metz, Toul, and Verdun in 1552, under the emperor Charles V. but besides, that this territory belonged to ancient Gaul, it might be considered rather as an excrescence, than a natural part of the Germanic body. Neither Ferdinand I. nor his successors made any attempt to recover those towns. The emperors of the house of Austria being become kings of Hungary, were continually in fear of the Turks, and incapable of disturbing France, weak as this kingdom was, from the reign of Francis II. to that of Henry IV. German princes would come and plunder this country, but the Germanic body would not join to destroy it.

Ferdinand I. in vain attempted to unite the three religions which divided the empire, and the princes who sometimes waged war against one another. The ancient maxim, *divide & impera*, did not suit him. It was necessary for Germany to be united, before it could be powerful: but far from being united, it was dismembered. It was in his time that the Teutonic knights made a present of Livonia to the Poles, which was reputed an Imperial province, and of which the Russians are now in possession. The secularization of the bishoprics of Saxony and Brandenburg, was not a dismemberment of the empire, but a great revolution which strengthened the power of those princes, while it weakened that of the emperor.

Maximilian

Maximilian II. was even less absolute than Ferdinand I. Had the empire preserved any kind of vigour, it would have maintained its rights over the Netherlands, which were indeed an Imperial province. The emperor and the diet were their natural judges. Those people who were stiled rebels a long time, ought to have been put under the ban of the empire: yet Maximilian II. suffered *William the Silent*, prince of Orange, to wage war in the Netherlands at the head of German troops, without interfering in the quarrel. In vain did this emperor get himself elected king of Poland in 1575, after the departure of Henry III. king of France, which was considered as an abdication: Battori, *waywood*, or governor of Transylvania, the emperor's vassal, carried the election against his sovereign; and the protection of the Ottoman port, to which this Battori had had recourse, proved more powerful than the court of Vienna.

Rodolphus II. succeeded his father Maximilian II. and surpassed him in the weakness of his administration. He was emperor, and king of Bohemia and Hungary at the same time; yet he had no sort of influence either in Bohemia, Hungary, or Germany; much less in Italy. The reign of Rodolphus seems to prove that there is no such thing as a general rule in politics.

This prince was reckoned far more incapable of governing, than Henry III. king of France. Yet the conduct of the latter cost him his life, and was very near being the ruin of the kingdom; while the behaviour of the former though a great deal more weak, occasioned no disturbance in Germany. This is, because in France all the great lords wanted to raise themselves on the ruins of the throne, whereas the German lords were already raised.

On some occasions it is necessary a prince should know the art of war. Rodolphus, for want of this knowledge, saw all Hungary a prey to the Turks. Germany was under so wretched a government, that they were obliged to make a public collection, to oppose the Ottoman conquerors. A box was put up at the door of every church. This was the first war that had been ever carried

carried on by charitable contributions; it was looked upon as holy, but did not prove the more successful on that account: and had it not been for the disturbances of the Seraglio, in all probability Hungary would have continued for ever subject to the Turks.

The same thing came to pass under this emperor in Germany, as had lately happened in France under Henry III. There were two leagues, one catholic, the other protestant, and those sovereigns could never stem the torrent of either. Religion, so long the cause of commotions in Germany, was now only a pretext. The point in dispute was the succession to the duchies of Cleves and Juliers. This was still a consequence of the feudal law; and there was hardly any other way of deciding the property of those fiefs, than by the sword. The contest was between the houses of Saxony, Brandenburg, and Newburgh. The archduke Leopold, the emperor's cousin, had taken possession of Cleves, till the affair could be determined. This dispute was the only cause, as we have already observed, of the death of Henry IV. who was preparing to march to the assistance of the protestant league. This victorious prince, followed by well disciplined troops, by the greatest generals, and the best ministers in Europe, was upon the point of making an advantageous use of the weakness of Rodolphus and Philip III.

The death of Henry IV. defeated this grand design, but did not render the emperor Rodolphus more fortunate. He had resigned Hungary, Austria, and Moravia to his brother Matthias, when the king of France was making preparations to march into Germany: after getting rid of so formidable an enemy, still he was obliged to resign Bohemia to Matthias, and thenceforward he lived as a private person, only preserving the title of emperor.

During his reign every thing was transacted without his notice: he did not so much as concern himself about the extraordinary affair of Gerhard de Truchses, elector of Cologne, who would fain keep his archbishopric and his wife, but was expelled from the electorate by the arms

arms of his canons, and of his competitor. This surprising inactivity was owing to a principle still more extraordinary in an emperor. He cultivated a philosophy which taught him every thing that could be known at that time, except to fulfil the duties of a sovereign. He was better pleased to converse with the celebrated Tycho Brahe, than to assemble the states of Hungary or Bohemia.

The famous astronomical tables of Tycho Brahe and Kepler, bear this emperor's name, being called the Rodolphine tables; (as those which were made in Spain by two Arabians in the twelfth century, went by the name of king Alphonso.) The Germans distinguished themselves in this century by the first dawning of sound physics. They never succeeded in the polite arts, like the Italians; nor indeed did they apply themselves much that way. The faculty of invention in natural science is ever given to the patient and the laborious. This turn of mind had been observed for some time in the Germans, and extended to their northern neighbours. Tycho Brahe was a Dane. It was very extraordinary, especially at that time, to see a Danish gentleman spend a hundred thousand crowns of his own fortune, besides what he had received from Frederic II. king of Denmark, upon building an observatory, together with a small town inhabited by a number of literati. It was called *Uranienburg*, or the *City of the Stars*. Tycho Brahe had indeed the vulgar weakness of giving credit to judicial astrology, but this did not render him less an astronomer, nor less able in mechanics. His fate was the same with that of other great men; he was persecuted in his own country after the death of the king his protector: but he found a second patron in the emperor Rodolphus, who made him amends for all his losses, and for the injustice of courtiers.

Copernicus had discovered the real system of the world, before Tycho Brahe invented his, which is only an ingenious hypothesis. The ray of light which now illumines the world, came from the little town of Thorn

in Polish Prussia, about the middle of the sixteenth century.

In the beginning of the seventeenth century Kepler, a native of the duchy of Wurtemberg, divided the mathematical laws of the course of the stars, and was looked upon as a legislator in astronomy. Lord Bacon was proposing new sciences at that time; but Copernicus and Kepler were inventing them. No greater efforts had been made by the ancients; nor had Greece been illustrated by brighter discoveries: but the other arts flourished at the same time in Greece; whereas in Germany, physics alone were cultivated by a small number of recluse sages. The multitude were rude and ignorant; in some provinces they were almost strangers to reflection, and only knew how to hate one another for the sake of religion.

At length the catholic and protestant leagues plunged Germany into a civil war of thirty years, and reduced her to a more deplorable state, than that of France before the peaceful and happy reign of Henry IV.

In the year 1619, died the emperor Matthias, successor of Rodolphus, and the Imperial dignity had like to have gone from the house of Austria; but the votes were all united at length in favour of Ferdinand archduke of Gratz. Maximilian of Bavaria, who had disputed the empire with that prince, dropped his pretensions: he did more, he maintained the Imperial throne at the expence of his blood and treasure, and established the grandeur of a house that has since crushed his posterity. An union between two branches of the same family, might have changed the fate of Germany; these were the elector Palatine, and the duke of Bavaria. But there were two grand obstacles against such an union; emulation, and difference of religion. Frederick, the elector Palatine, was a Calvinist, the duke of Bavaria a Catholic. This elector Palatine was one of the most unfortunate princes in his time, and the cause of the long calamities of Germany.

Never were the notions of liberty more generally diffused throughout Europe, than at that time. Hungary, Bohemia,

Bohemia, and even Austria were as jealous of their privileges as the English. This spirit prevailed in Germany, ever since the latter end of the reign of Charles V. The example of the seven United Provinces was ever present to the minds of a people, who pretended to the same privileges, and who thought themselves more considerable than the Dutch.

When the emperor Matthias caused his cousin Ferdinand of Gratz to be elected king of Hungary and Bohemia in 1618, and made the other archdukes resign Austria in his favour; Hungary, Bohemia and Austria, complained that no regard was paid to the privileges of the states. Religion made a share of the Bohemian grievances; and their fury knew no bounds. The protestants would fain rebuild the temples demolished by the catholics. The emperor's council of state declared against the protestants; these rushed into the hall where the council were assembled, and flung three of the principal magistrates out of the window. This was a specimen of the violence of the populace, which generally exceeds even the oppression against which they complain. But what was more extraordinary, the rebels published a manifesto, pretending they had only acted in conformity to the laws, and that they had a right to throw the tyrannical members of the council out of the window. Austria sided with Bohemia; and in the midst of these troubles Ferdinand of Gratz was chosen emperor.

His new dignity did not frighten the protestants of Bohemia, who were grown very formidable: they thought they had a right to depose an elective king; which made them offer their crown to the elector Palatine, son-in-law of James I. king of England. The elector accepted of the throne, without a sufficient force to maintain it. His relation, Maximilian of Bavaria, at the head of the Imperial troops and his own, defeated him at the battle of Prague, and stripped him of his crown and his electorate.

This day began the bloody war of thirty years. The battle of Prague decided for a while the ancient quarrel between the emperor and the princes of the empire: it made

made Ferdinand II. despotic. He put the elector Palatine under the ban of the empire, merely by a decree of his Aulic council; and he proscribed all the princes and lords of the elector's party, notwithstanding the Imperial capitulations, which could bind only those that had not power to break them.

The elector Palatine fled into Silesia, and thence successively to Denmark, to Holland, to England, and to France: he was one of those unhappy princes on whom fortune ever frowns, blasting their most sanguine expectations. He received no succours from his father-in-law the king of England, who was deaf to the importunate cries of the nation, to the solicitations of his son-in-law, and to the interest of the protestant party, of which he might have been the head: he received none from Louis XIII. though it was evidently the interest of that monarch to hinder the princes of Germany from being crushed. Louis XIII. was not then under the direction of cardinal Richelieu. The only succour now left to the Palatine family, and to the protestant union of Germany, was that of two warriors, who had each a little wandering army, like the Italian *Condottieri*: one was a prince of Brunswick, who had no other estate than the administration or usurpation of the bishopric of Halberstadt; he stiled himself "The friend of God, and "the enemy of priests," which last appellation he merited, subsisting intirely by the plunder of churches: the other support of this then ruined party, was a bastard adventurer of the house of Mansfeldt, one as deserving of the title of *enemy of priests*, as the prince of Brunswick. These two auxiliaries might help indeed to ravage part of the empire, but not to restore the elector Palatine, or the equilibrium of the Germanic body. The emperor having thus established his power in Germany, assembled a diet at Ratisbon, wherein he 1623 declared "That the elector Palatine having incurred "the guilt of high treason, his estates, chattels, and "dignities, are devolved to the Imperial domain; but "being unwilling to diminish the number of electors, "he wills, commands, and ordains that Maximilian of "Bavaria shall be invested with the Palatine electo-

“rate.” Accordingly he gave this investiture from the throne, and the vice-chancellor declared that his Imperial majesty did confer the electoral dignity in *the fulness of his power*.

The protestant league being very nigh overpowered, made new efforts to prevent their total destruction. They chose Christian IV. king of Denmark, for their chief; and England supplied them with some money. But neither English money, nor the troops of Denmark, nor Brunswick, nor Mansfeldt could prevail against the emperor; so that they all only helped to ravage Germany. Ferdinand II. was every where triumphant, by means of his two generals, the duke of Walsstein, and count Tilly. The king of Denmark was always defeated at the head of his armies, and Ferdinand without stirring out of his palace was victorious and triumphant.

The emperor put the duke of Mecklenburgh, one of the chiefs of the protestant confederacy, under the ban of the empire, and gave away this duchy to his general Walsstein. In the same manner he proscribed Charles duke of Mantua, for taking possession of a country without his orders, which devolved to him by inheritance. The Imperial troops surprized and plundered Mantua, spreading terror all over Italy. Ferdinand was beginning to tighten that old chain, which heretofore connected Italy with the empire, and had been slackened a long time. An army of a hundred and fifty thousand men, living at discretion in Germany, rendered him quite despotic. The people, over whom he exercised this absolute power, were very wretched: one may judge of this by their money, the numerical value of which was four times greater than the ancient value, and besides it was debased. The duke of Walsstein used publicly to say, that the time was come for reducing the electors to the condition of the dukes and peers of France, and the bishops to the quality of Imperial chaplains. This is the same Walsstein who afterwards wanted to become independent, and to bring his superiors into subjection, only to raise himself over their heads.

The

The use which Ferdinand II. made of his successes, and of his power, proved destructive to both. He was so imprudent as to attempt to dictate in the affairs of Sweden and Poland, and to take part against the young king Gustavus-Adolphus, who was then supporting his pretensions against his relation Sigismund king of Poland. Hence, by obliging this prince to march into Germany, he paved the way for his own ruin, which he further hastened by driving the protestant princes to despair.

Ferdinand II. with just reason, thought himself powerful enough to break the treaty of Passau made by Charles V. and to command of his own authority all the princes and lords to restore the bishopricks and church lands, which they had seized into their own hands. This edict is much stronger than that for revoking the edict of Nants, which made such a noise under Louis XIV. These two enterprizes, of a similar nature, had very different success. Gustavus-Adolphus, at the invitation of the protestant princes, whom the king of Denmark durst no longer assist, determined to assert their cause, at the same time that he avenged his own.

The emperor wanted to restore the church to her possessions, in order to subject her to himself; and cardinal Richelieu declared against him. Even Rome traversed his designs; for the apprehension of his power was stronger than the interests of religion. It was not more extraordinary that the minister of the most Christian king, and even the court of Rome, should maintain the protestants in Germany against a formidable emperor, than it had been to see Francis I. and Henry II. in alliance with the Turks against Charles. This sufficiently proves how easily religion is silenced by political interests.

People are fond of attributing every great enterprize to one man, when he has succeeded in some few. It is a prejudice very common in France to think that the cardinal called the arms of Gustavus-Adolphus into Germany, and alone paved the way for this great revolution. But it is evident that he did no more than take advantage of conjunctures. Ferdinand II. had in reality declared

clared war against Gustavus: he wanted to strip him of Livonia, of which this young conqueror had possessed himself; he sided with Sigismond his competitor to the kingdom of Sweden; and he refused him the title of king. Thus interest, revenge and ambition, called Gustavus into Germany; and even if the French ministry had not assisted him with some money, when he was in Pomerania, still he would have tried his fortune, since the war was already begun.

1631 He was victorious in Pomerania, when France concluded a treaty with him. Three hundred thousand crowns in hand, and a yearly subsidy of twelve hundred thousand livres, were neither a mighty sum, nor a vast exertion of politics, nor a sufficient assistance. Gustavus-Adolphus did all by himself. He came into Germany with less than fifteen thousand men, but had quickly near forty thousand, by recruiting in the empire, and making the Germans themselves contribute to his conquests. He obliged the elector of Brandenburg to deliver up the fortress of Spandau with all the strong passes; and the elector of Saxony to give him the command of his troops.

Sept. 17, The Imperial army, commanded by Tilly, was in-
1631 tirely routed in the neighbourhood of Leipzig. The whole country submitted to Gustavus, from the banks of the Elbe to the Rhine. He restored the duke of Mecklenburgh to his dominions at one end of Germany; and instantly he was at the other extremity, in the Palatinate, after having made himself master of Mentz.

The emperor all this while never stirred from Vienna: in less than one campaign he fell from that high pitch of grandeur which had appeared so formidable; and he was reduced so low as to ask money and troops of pope Urban VIII. who refused him both. He would fain persuade the court of Rome to publish a crusade against Gustavus; but the holy father promised a jubilee instead of a crusade. Gustavus marched triumphant through Germany; and took the elector Palatine with him to Munich, where the latter had the satisfaction of entering the palace of the very prince that had dispossessed him

of

of his dominions. The latter was just upon the point of being restored to his Palatinate, and even placed on the throne of Bohemia, by the hands of the conqueror, when at the second battle near Leipfick, in the plains of Lutzen, Gustavus was slain in the midst of his victory. This misfortune proved fatal to the elector, who, ^{Nov. 6,} being infirm at that time, and looking upon his affairs ¹⁶³² as desperate, died of chagrin.

Let those who wonder how the swarms that issued formerly from the north, should be able to subdue the Roman empire; let them, I say, but take a view of what great feats Gustavus performed in two years, against a nation more warlike than the Romans at the time when these were conquered, and their surprize will soon cease.

It is well worthy of attention, that neither the death of Gustavus, nor the minority of his daughter Christina, queen of Sweden, nor the bloody overthrow of the Swedes at Nordlingen, weakened their arms. It was then that cardinal Richelieu played his cards so well: he gave law to the Swedes, and to the protestant princes of Germany, while he supported them: by this step France afterwards obtained Alsace, at the expence of the house of Austria.

Gustavus Adolphus had left behind him great generals of his own training up; which has been the case with most conquerors. They were assisted by a hero of the house of Saxony, Bernard of Weimar, a descendant of the ancient electoral branch dispossessed by Charles V. and still breathing hatred and revenge against the house of Austria. This prince's whole estate consisted in a small army, formed and disciplined by himself in those troublesome times, and who depended for their subsistence on the point of their swords. France paid this army at that time, as it did the Swedes. The emperor, who never stirred from his cabinet, had no great general to oppose them. He had destroyed the celebrated duke of Wallstein, the only man capable of restoring the honour of his arms, and giving stability to his throne; from an apprehension lest this duke, whom
he

he had invested with an unlimited power over his armies, Feb. should make use of that power against himself. He 3, employed people to assassinate this general, who wanted 1634 to be independent.

Thus it was that Ferdinand I. got rid of cardinal Martinusius, who was too powerful in Hungary; and that Henry III. destroyed the cardinal and his brother the duke of Guise.

Had Ferdinand II. commanded his own armies in person, as in such critical conjunctures he ought to have done, there would have been no occasion for having recourse to this impotent revenge, which he looked upon as a necessary expedient, though it did not render him more fortunate.

Never was Germany more humbled than at this very time: it was under the direction of a Swedish chancellor, who held all the protestant princes in subjection. This minister, whose name was Oxenstiern, animated with the spirit of his late master, would not suffer the French at first to share the fruits of Gustavus's victories; but, after the battle of Nordlingen, he was obliged to desire the French minister would condescend to seize on Alsace, under the title of protector. Cardinal Richelieu promised this province to Bernard of Weimar; but did all he could to secure it to France. Hitherto this minister had temporized, and acted underhand; but now he pulled off the mask, and declared war against the two branches of the house of Austria, greatly weakened in Spain and in the empire. This was the most critical period of this war of thirty years. France, Sweden, Holland, and Savoy, attacked the house of Austria all at once, and the true system of Henry IV. was pursued.

Feb. Under these melancholy circumstances died Ferdi- 15, nand II. at the age of fifty-nine, after a reign of eigh- 1637 teen years, continually disturbed by intestine or foreign wars, while he never commanded but in his cabinet. He was unfortunate, because in his prosperity he thought himself obliged to be sanguinary, and afterwards he met with great disappointments. Germany was more hap- less than he; having been ravaged alternately by her own

own natives, by the Swedes, and by the French; desolated by famine; and plunged into barbarism, the inevitable consequence of such a long and bloody war.

Ferdinand II. has been commended as a great emperor, yet Germany was never in a more lamentable condition than during his reign; whereas it was happy under that Rodolphus II. who is so much despised.

Ferdinand II. left the empire to his son Ferdinand III. already elected king of the Romans, but he left him an empire rent and divided, the spoils being shared by France and Sweden.

Under the reign of Ferdinand III. the Austrian power continued to decline. The Swedes got footing in Germany; while France, in conjunction with that crown, constantly maintained the protestant party with men and money: and, though she was embarrassed herself in a war against Spain, which in the beginning proved unsuccessful; though her minister had frequent conspiracies or civil wars to struggle against; yet she triumphed over the empire, just as a person wounded will, with assistance, throw down another man, who is wounded more dangerously than himself.

Bernard, duke of Weimar, the descendant of that unfortunate duke of Saxony, who had been dispossessed by Charles V. revenged the distresses of his family upon the house of Austria. He was one of Gustavus's generals, who maintained the glory of Sweden after his death; and he proved the most fatal of them all to the emperor. It is true he set out with the loss of the great battle of Nordlingen; but having afterwards, with the assistance of French money, raised an army entirely dependent on himself, he gained four victories over the Imperialists in less than four months. He reckoned he should be able to erect a sovereignty for himself along the Rhine; and France had guaranteed the possession of Alsace to him by treaty.

This new conqueror died at the age of thirty-five, 1639 and left his army to his brothers, as a person may bequeath an estate. But France, having more money than the duke of Weimar's brothers, purchased this

army, and continued the conquests upon her own account. Marshal Guebriant, viscount Turenne, and the duke d'Enghien, afterwards the great Condé, finished what the duke of Weimar had begun. The Swedish generals, Bannier and Torstenfon, pressed hard upon Austria on one side, while Turenne and Condé attacked her on the other.

Ferdinand III. tired of so many unprosperous strokes of fortune, was obliged at length to conclude the peace
1648 of Westphalia. In virtue of this famous treaty, the Swedes and the French were become the legislators of Germany in politics and religion. The dispute between the emperor and the princes of the empire, which had lasted seven hundred years, was at length decided. Germany became a great aristocracy, composed of a king, electors, princes, and Imperial cities. Notwithstanding this country had been so exhausted, it was obliged to pay five millions of rix-dollars to the Swedes, the plunderers and pacifiers of Germany. The kings of Sweden were made princes of the empire, having acquired the best part of Pomerania, Stettin, Wismar, Rugen, Verden, Bremen, and other considerable territories. The king of France was acknowledged landgrave of Alsace, without being prince of the empire.

The Palatine family was at length restored to all its rights, except the upper Palatinate, which remained to the branch of Bavaria. The pretensions even of private gentlemen were discussed before the plenipotentiaries, as in a supreme court of justice. Above a hundred and forty restitutions were decreed and complied with. The three religions, the Roman, the Lutheran, and the Calvinist were established. The Imperial chamber was composed of four and twenty protestant members, and six and twenty catholics; and the emperor was obliged to admit of six protestants even in his Aulic council at Vienna.

Had it not been for this peace, Germany would have become, what it had been heretofore under the descendants of Charlemagne, almost a savage desert. The towns were ruined from Silesia as far as the Rhine, the
lands

lands lay fallow, and the villages uninhabited. The city of Magdeburg, which Tilly, the Imperial general, had reduced to ashes, was not yet rebuilt. The trade of Augsburgh and Nurenberg was lost. Scarce any other manufacture remained but that of iron and steel. Money was extremely scarce; the people were strangers to all the conveniences of life; and in their manners had contracted a stiff severity, in consequence of so long and ruinous a war. It required a whole century to polish and improve this country. The French refugees first began to reform the taste of the Germans, who of all other nations have benefited the most by the revocation of the edict of Nants. Every thing else came of itself; but was the work of time. The arts followed one another; and Germany is at length become as flourishing a country, as Italy was in the sixteenth century, when such a number of princes vied with each other for politeness and magnificence.

C H A P. CLXXIX.

Of England to the Year 1641.

AS Spain was weakened after Philip II. and France fell into decay and disorder after Henry IV. till the successful administration of cardinal Richelieu; so England was long upon the decline after the reign of Elizabeth. Her successor James I. ought naturally to have had more weight in Europe than that prince, since he united the crown of Scotland to that of England; yet his reign was far less glorious.

It is to be observed, that the laws of succession to the throne had not that sanction and force in England as in France and Spain. One of James's rights was said to 1603 be queen Elizabeth's will, by which he was called to the crown; and indeed he had been afraid of not being mentioned in the testamentary disposition of a queen so

highly respected, and whose last will might greatly influence the nation.

Notwithstanding his obligation to Elizabeth he did not wear mourning for the murderer of his mother. As soon as he was proclaimed king, he thought it was by right divine, and therefore took the title of *sacred majesty*. This was the first ground of the nation's discontent, and of the heavy calamities which beset his son and his posterity.

In the beginning of his reign, was formed one of the most horrid plots that ever entered into human imagination: all other conspiracies, the effect of revenge, of politics, of the barbarity of civil wars, or even of fanaticism itself, are nothing to compare to the gunpowder-treason. The Roman catholics of England having expected more indulgence from the king than he was inclined to shew them: some of this persuasion, possessed with that party rage, and that melancholy gloom which prompts men to the most flagitious crimes, determined to make their religion predominate in England, by cutting off, at one blow, the king, the royal family, and all the peers of the realm. One Percy, of the Northumberland family, with a person named Catesby, Feb. 1605 and several others, formed a scheme of lodging six and thirty barrels of gunpowder, under the hall where the king was to harangue both houses of parliament. Never was there a crime more easy to execute; or that bid fairer for success. No body could suspect so strange, so horrid an enterprize; nor did there seem to be any obstacle against its being carried into execution. The thirty-six barrels of gunpowder had been purchased in Holland at different times, and were already lodged under the house of lords, in a coal-vault hired several months before by Percy, they only waited for the day the parliament was to meet; and they had nothing to fear but the remorse of the conspirators: but the Jesuits, Garnet and Oldcorn, to whom they had made their confession, removed all sort of scruple. Percy, who had the heart to murder the nobility and the king, took pity on a friend of his, my lord Monteagle, and this

act

act of compassion defeated the whole contrivance. He employed a strange hand to write the following words to this peer; "I would advise you, as you tender your life, to shift off your attendance at this parliament: For God and man have concurred to punish the wickedness of this time. And think not slightly of this advertisement, but retire yourself into the country, where you may expect the event in safety. For though there be no appearance of any stir, yet, I say, they will receive a terrible blow this parliament, and yet they shall not see who hurts them. This council is not to be contemned, because it may do you good, and can do you no harm; for the danger is past, as soon as you burn this letter."

Percy was secure within himself; he did not think it possible for any body to guess, that the whole house of lords should be blown up by gunpowder: yet, when this letter came to be read in council, and none of the members could conjecture the nature of the plot, the king, reflecting on the short duration of the danger, hit exactly on the design of the conspirators. He ordered the vault below the house of lords to be inspected, the very night before the parliament was to meet: they found a man at the door, with matches in his pocket, and a horse waiting for him; they likewise found the six and thirty barrels of gunpowder.

Upon the first news of the discovery, Percy and the rest of the ringleaders had time to muster up a hundred persons of the Roman catholic persuasion, who sold their lives very dear. Only eight of the conspirators were taken and executed. The two Jesuits underwent the same punishment. The king declared, that they had been fairly tried and condemned: but their order maintained they were innocent, and made martyrs of them. Such is the spirit of the times in all countries, where the minds of the people are perverted by religious disputes.

Yet the gunpowder treason was the only occasion, on which any great severity was shewn in England during the reign of James I. This prince far from being of a persecuting spirit, openly declared for toleration; he
was

highly respected, and whose last will might greatly influence the nation.

Notwithstanding his obligation to Elizabeth he did not wear mourning for the murderer of his mother. As soon as he was proclaimed king, he thought it was by right divine, and therefore took the title of *sacred majesty*. This was the first ground of the nation's discontent, and of the heavy calamities which beset his son and his posterity.

In the beginning of his reign, was formed one of the most horrid plots that ever entered into human imagination: all other conspiracies, the effect of revenge, of politics, of the barbarity of civil wars, or even of fanaticism itself, are nothing to compare to the gunpowder-treason. The Roman catholics of England having expected more indulgence from the king than he was inclined to shew them: some of this persuasion, possessed with that party rage, and that melancholy gloom which prompts men to the most flagitious crimes, determined to make their religion predominate in England, by cutting off, at one blow, the king, the royal family, and all the peers of the realm. One Percy, of the Northumberland family, with a person named Catesby, and several others, formed a scheme of lodging six and thirty barrels of gunpowder, under the hall where the king was to harangue both houses of parliament. Never was there a crime more easy to execute; or that bid fairer for success. No body could suspect so strange, so horrid an enterprize; nor did there seem to be any obstacle against its being carried into execution. The thirty-six barrels of gunpowder had been purchased in Holland at different times, and were already lodged under the house of lords, in a coal-vault hired several months before by Percy, they only waited for the day the parliament was to meet; and they had nothing to fear but the remorse of the conspirators: but the Jesuits, Garnet and Oldcorn, to whom they had made their confession, removed all sort of scruple. Percy, who had the heart to murder the nobility and the king, took pity on a friend of his, my lord Monteagle, and this

act

act of compassion defeated the whole contrivance. He employed a strange hand to write the following words to this peer; "I would advise you, as you tender your life, to shift off your attendance at this parliament. For God and man have concurred to punish the wickedness of this time. And think not slightly of this advertisement, but retire yourself into the country, where you may expect the event in safety. For though there be no appearance of any stir, yet, I say, they will receive a terrible blow this parliament, and yet they shall not see who hurts them. This council is not to be contemned, because it may do you good, and can do you no harm; for the danger is past, as soon as you burn this letter."

Percy was secure within himself; he did not think it possible for any body to guess, that the whole house of lords should be blown up by gunpowder: yet, when this letter came to be read in council, and none of the members could conjecture the nature of the plot, the king, reflecting on the short duration of the danger, hit exactly on the design of the conspirators. He ordered the vault below the house of lords to be inspected, the very night before the parliament was to meet: they found a man at the door, with matches in his pocket, and a horse waiting for him; they likewise found the six and thirty barrels of gunpowder.

Upon the first news of the discovery, Percy and the rest of the ringleaders had time to muster up a hundred persons of the Roman catholic persuasion, who sold their lives very dear. Only eight of the conspirators were taken and executed. The two Jesuits underwent the same punishment. The king declared, that they had been fairly tried and condemned: but their order maintained they were innocent, and made martyrs of them. Such is the spirit of the times in all countries, where the minds of the people are perverted by religious disputes.

Yet the gunpowder treason was the only occasion, on which any great severity was shewn in England during the reign of James I. This prince far from being of a persecuting spirit, openly declared for toleration; he

was

was particularly angry with the presbyterians, for teaching in those days that every papist must be damned.

He reigned two and twenty years, during which time the nation enjoyed peace and plenty, and her commerce was in a flourishing condition. Yet this prince was despised both abroad and at home. He was despised abroad, because being at the head of the protestant party in Europe, he did not support it against the Roman catholic powers, in the grand crisis of the war of Bohemia, but abandoned his son-in-law the elector Palatine; negotiating when he ought to have fought; a dupe both to the courts of Vienna and Madrid; ever sending pompous embassies, and never having any allies.

The contempt in which he was held by foreign nations, contributed greatly to deprive him of the esteem of his subjects. His authority in England was greatly diminished through his own fault, by endeavouring to extend it beyond its proper bounds, and by continually ringing in the ears of his parliament, that God had made him absolute master over them, and that all their privileges were only concessions from the indulgence of their kings. By such speeches he set the parliament upon examining into the regal power, and the rights of the people. They began to think of settling the boundaries of both, without well knowing where to begin.

The kings eloquence only served to excite the severity of criticism; nor did his subjects pay all that justice to his erudition, which he thought it deserved. Henry IV. used to call him by no other name than *master James*, nor did his subjects give him more flattering titles. In one of his speeches to both houses, he makes use of these words, "I have piped unto you, and you have not danced; I have mourned, and you have not lamented." Thus bringing his prerogative into question by idle speeches, which were but ill received, he hardly ever obtained the subsidies he demanded. His profusion, and his wants, obliged him, like a great many other princes, to make a sale of dignities, and titles; for which the vanity of mankind pays very dear.

He created two hundred baronets, each of whom paid

two

two thousand pounds sterling for this trifling honour. Their whole privilege consisted in having the precedency of knights: but neither of them could sit in the house of lords; and the rest of the nation made but a very slight account of this new distinction.

What alienated the minds of the English from him more than any thing else, was his giving himself up to favourites. Louis XIII. Philip III. and James I. had the same foible at the same time: and while Louis XIII. was absolutely governed by Cadenet, created duke of Luines; Philip III. by Sandoval, made duke of Lerma; James was under the same subjection to a Scotchman of the name of Carr, whom he made earl of Somerset. He forsook this favourite afterwards for George Villiers, just as a woman changes one lover for another.

This George Villiers was the famous duke of Buckingham, known throughout Europe, for the comeliness of his person, for his taste of gallantry, and for his ambition. He was the first gentleman that had been ever made duke in England, without being related to the Royal family. It was very droll to see a royal theologian, who had been eminent for his controversial writings, delivering himself up entirely to a favourite knight errant. Buckingham persuaded the prince of Wales, afterwards the unfortunate Charles I. to go over to Madrid in disguise, in order to make love in person to the infanta of Spain, between whom and this young prince a match was actually negotiating; and he offered his service as squire upon this romantic expedition. James, who was called the Solomon of England, consented to this odd adventure, in which he exposed the person of his son. The more he was obliged to carry himself fair at that time with the Spanish branch of the house of Austria, the less able was he to serve the protestant cause, or that of his son-in-law the elector Palatine.

To complete the adventure, the duke of Buckingham fell in love with the duchess d'Olivarez; and after affronting the duke her husband, then prime minister, he broke off the match with the infanta; upon which the prince of Wales returned to England as precipitately

tately as he left it. The duke negotiated soon after a match between Charles and Henrietta, daughter of Henry IV. and sister of Louis XIII. and though he fell into greater indiscretions in France than in Spain, he succeeded in his negotiation. But James never recovered his credit with his subjects. Those prerogatives of royal majesty, upon which he was ever expatiating in his speeches, though he did not maintain them by his actions, gave rise to a faction, which subverted the throne, and disposed of it more than once, after staining it with blood. This was the faction of the puritans, which still subsists under the name of Whigs; while the opposite party, that of the church of England, and friends of the royal authority, had taken the denomination of Tories. These animosities soon began to inspire the nation with a spirit of severity, violence and melancholy, which destroyed the arts and sciences just as they were beginning to bud.

A few men of genius in the reign of Elizabeth had cultivated the field of literature, which till then had been neglected in England. Shakespeare and Ben Johnson modelled the theatre. Spenser revived epic poetry: and Bacon, who deserves a higher esteem for his literary labours than for those he underwent as chancellor, opened altogether a new road in philosophy. The minds of the people began to be polished and improved; when ecclesiastical disputes, and animosities between king and parliament plunged the nation again into a state of barbarism.

The limits of the regal prerogative, of the privileges of parliament, and of the liberties of the people, were difficult to ascertain, as well in England as in Scotland. Nor were the rights of the English and Scotch episcopacy less difficult to settle. Henry VIII. had broke down all sort of fences; Elizabeth found some newly erected, which she pulled down, and put up again with great dexterity and art. James I. disputed; he did not demolish those fences; but he pretended that they ought to be demolished; and the nation forewarned by this declaration, was preparing to defend them.

Charles I.

Charles I. soon after his accession to the crown, wanted 1629 to put in practice what his father had too often proposed, but never executed.

England, as well as Germany, Poland, Sweden and Denmark, was in possession of granting subsidies to her sovereigns, as a free and voluntary gift. Charles I. wanted to succour his brother-in-law the elector Palatine, and the protestants against the emperor. His father had entered upon this design the last year of his life, when it was too late. Money was wanting to send troops to the lower Palatinate; it was likewise wanting for other expences: for it is this metal alone that constitutes power, since mankind have made it the universal representative. The king demanded money as a right; the parliament would grant none but as a free gift: and before they would grant any at all, they insisted on a redress of certain grievances. If they were to wait for a redress of grievances in every kingdom, before troops could be raised, they never would go to war. Charles I. was determined to this armament by his sister the electress Palatine; the same who forced her husband to accept of the crown of Bohemia, who solicited the king her father full five years to assist the elector, and who at length by means of the duke of Buckingham's instigations obtained the succours so long retarded. The parliament granted only a very small subsidy. There had been some instances of English kings, who not caring to summon their parliaments, and yet being in want of money, had extorted sums from private people by the way of loan. This used to be a forced loan; he who lent, generally lost his money; and he who would not lend, was sent to prison. These tyrannical schemes had been practised occasionally, when a king was settled on the throne, and had an army with which he could domineer with impunity. Charles I. made use of this method, but with some mitigation: he borrowed money, with which he equipped a fleet, and embarked a few troops who returned without doing any thing.

1626 He was obliged to call a new parliament. The house of commons, instead of going upon the supplies, were for impeaching his favourite the duke of Buckingham, whose power and pride were extremely disagreeable to the nation. Charles far from submitting to the affront done him in the person of his minister, imprisoned two members of the house of commons, the most sanguine for the prosecution. This despotic act, in defiance of the laws, was not supported; and the timidity with which he released the two prisoners, set great numbers against him, who had been already irritated by the detaining of those two members. He imprisoned a peer of the realm upon the same account, and set him at liberty in the same manner. This was not the way to obtain supplies: and indeed he got none. The forced loans were continued. Soldiers were billeted on those citizens who would not lend; which entirely estranged the affections of the people from their sovereign. The duke of Buckingham increased the general discontent by his fruitless expedition to Rochelle. The king convened a new parliament; but it was only convening so many exasperated citizens; they thought of nothing but of settling the rights and privileges of the people and parliament; they voted that the famous *Habeas Corpus* Act, the guardian of English liberty, should never be broke through; that no monies should be raised but by parliament; and that it was a violation of the liberty and property of the subject to billet any soldiers upon them. The king determining to support his authority, and yet demanding money, weakened the one, without obtaining the other. The commons were still for impeaching the duke of Buckingham; when an Irish fanatic, named Felton, whom this general animosity had rendered quite furious, assassinated the prime minister in his own house, surrounded by courtiers. 1628 This bold stroke shews to what a pitch of madness the nation had been already worked up.

There was a small duty upon the importation and exportation of merchandizes, which was called *tunnage and poundage*. The late king had always enjoyed it by act of

of parliament; and Charles did not think he had need of a second act. Three merchants of London having refused to pay this small tax, the custom-house officers seized their goods. One of those merchants was a member of the lower house. The commons being obliged to defend their own privileges, together with the liberties of the people, proceeded against the officers of the customs. The king highly incensed, dissolved the parliament, and sent four members of the house of commons to prison. Such were the weak beginnings, which subverted the constitution, and stained the throne with blood.

To this source of public misfortunes, was added the torrent of ecclesiastical dissensions in Scotland. Charles wanted to execute his father's schemes in regard to religion, as well as government. Episcopacy was not suppressed in Scotland at the beginning of the reformation, before Mary Stuart's time; but those protestant bishops were subject to the presbyterians. The Scotch were governed by a republic of priests, all on a perfect equality. This was the only country in the world, where bishops derived no power from wealth and honours. They preserved their seats in parliament, their rights of peerage, and their ecclesiastical revenues; but they were pastors without a flock, and peers without weight or influence. The Scotch parliament, being all presbyterians, suffered episcopacy to continue, only to render it contemptible. The ancient abbeys were in the hands of laymen, who took their seats in parliament in virtue of this title. By degrees the number of those titular abbots diminished. James I. restored episcopacy with all its privileges. The king of England was not considered as the head of the church of Scotland; but being a native of that country, and distributing English money, with pensions, and offices among several members, he was more master at Edinburgh than at London. The restoration of episcopacy did not hinder the presbyterian assembly. Those two bodies always clashed, but the synodic commonwealth generally prevailed over the episcopal monarchy. James,

who looked upon the bishops as staunch friends, and the calvinistical elders as enemies, of the throne, thought he should be able at length to reconcile the people of Scotland to episcopacy, by introducing a new liturgy among them, the same as that of the church of England. He died without finishing his design, which his son Charles was desirous of carrying into execution.

This liturgy consisted in some forms of prayer, a few ceremonies, and a surplice which the ministers were to
 1637 wear in church. No sooner had the bishop of Edinburgh made a publication of the canons, whereby those different usages were established, than the people all rose up in great fury, and pelted him with stones. The disturbance spread from town to town. The presbyterians entered into a covenant, as if the point in question had been nothing less than the subversion of all laws human and divine. On the one hand that passion which prompts the great to support their enterprizes, and on the other the fury of a fanatic mob, produced a civil war in Scotland.

Little was it then suspected, that cardinal Richelieu could be the man, who fomented this civil war, and who paved the way for the fatal catastrophe of Charles I. This despotic minister wanted to hinder Mary de Medicis from being sheltered in England by her daughter: and to engage Charles in the interests of France: but the English monarch, more haughty than politic, gave such a refusal as irritated the cardinal. We find in a letter from this minister to the count d'Estades, at that time envoy in England, these remarkable words, which we have already mentioned: "The king of England
 " will be convinced before a year is expired, that he
 " ought not to despise me*."

One of the cardinal's secretaries was an Irish priest, whom he sent with money to London and Edinburgh, in order to sow discord among the puritans; and the letter to count d'Estades remains a monument of that

* See page 96,

dark proceeding. Were we to open the archives of all countries, we should see religion ever sacrificed to interest and revenge.

The Scotch took up arms. Charles had recourse to 1638 the church of England, and even to the English Roman catholics, who were equally animated against the puritans. They supplied him with money because it was a religious war; and for a few months he had an army of twenty thousand men. This army was hardly of any 1639 other use to him than to negotiate; and when the greatest part disbanded for want of pay, the negotiations were rendered more difficult. He was therefore 1640 under a necessity of determining once more upon war. History furnishes us with very few examples of magnanimity comparable to that of the king's privy council; they sacrificed great part of their fortunes to his majesty. The celebrated Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, and especially the marquis of Hamilton, distinguished themselves by their generosity on this occasion: the famous earl of Strafford alone gave twenty thousand pounds: but these contributions being insufficient, the king was once more obliged to call a parliament.

The house of commons did not look upon the Scotch as their enemies, but as brethren who taught them to defend their privileges. The king could get nothing from them but bitter invectives against the several methods he had adopted to raise the supplies. All the rights which the king had arrogated to himself, were declared usurpations: as the duty of tunnage and poundage, the ship money, the sale of exclusive privileges to merchants, the billeting of soldiers upon the inhabitants, in a word, every restraint upon public liberty. But their chief complaint was against a court of justice called the *Star Chamber*, which had exercised its jurisdiction with too great severity on many of the inhabitants. The king dissolved this new parliament, and by this step increased the grievances of the nation.

One would imagine that Charles had studied to exasperate the minds of his subjects: for instead of indulging the city of London under such delicate circumstances,

stances, he ordered the Londoners to be cited before the Star Chamber for the usurpation of some lands in Ireland, and obliged them to pay a considerable fine. He continued to levy every tax that the parliament had railed against. Were a despotic prince to act in this manner, his people would revolt; how much more the subjects of a limited monarchy? Being but ill supported by the English, and undermined by the intrigues of cardinal Richelieu, he could not hinder the army of Scotch puritans from penetrating as far as Newcastle.

1640 Having thus paved the way for his own misfortunes, he convened the parliament which completed his ruin.

This assembly began, like all the rest, with petitioning for a redress of grievances, for the suppression of the Star Chamber, and of arbitrary taxes, particularly that of ship-money; in a word, for triennial parliaments. Charles no longer able to resist, granted every thing. He imagined he should recover his authority by complying; but he was mistaken. He reckoned that his parliament would help him to be revenged of the Scotch, who had made an irruption into England; and this very parliament made the Scotch a present of three hundred thousand pounds, as a recompense for the civil war. He flattered himself he should be able to humble the puritan party in England; and very near the whole house of commons were puritans. He was extremely fond of the earl of Strafford, who had so generously devoted himself to his service; for which reason the house of commons impeached the earl of high treason. They charged him with misdemeanors; but such as were inevitable in those troublesome times, such as his good intention to serve his sovereign, and the generosity with which he had assisted him in his distress, might render excusable. The peers found him guilty; but the king's consent was requisite for his execution. The ferocious multitude called out aloud for his blood. Strafford carried his magnanimity so far, as to petition the king to consent to his death; and Charles was so

1641 weak as to sign this fatal sentence, which taught the English to spill other blood, far more precious.

C H A P. CLXXX.

Of the Misfortunes and Death of Charles I.

ENgland, Scotland, and Ireland, were at that time divided into violent factions as well as France; but in France it was only a cabal of princes and lords, against a prime minister, who aimed at reducing their power; whereas the party divisions in England under Charles I. implied a general convulsion in the minds of the people, a strong desire of changing the constitution of the kingdom, an ill-judged design of the royalists to establish despotic power, an extravagant passion in the people for liberty, thirst of power in the house of commons, an inclination in the bishops to crush the puritans, a scheme formed by the latter to humble the bishops, in a word, a regular but concealed plan in those who were called *independents*, to take advantage of the mistakes of all the rest, in order to become the predominant party.

In the midst of these disturbances, the Roman catho-^{Oa.} lics of Ireland thought it a very good opportunity to ¹⁶⁴¹ shake off the English yoke. Religion and liberty, those two sources of the most important actions, hurried them into an horrid attempt, unparalleled in history, except by the massacre of St. Bartholomew. They conspired to assassinate in one day all the protestants of Ireland; and accordingly they cut the throats of above forty thousand. This massacre has not the same degree of celebrity in the history of great crimes as that of St. Bartholomew, though it was as general, and accompanied with all the horrors that could distinguish such a fall of enthusiastical fury. But this conspiracy of one half of the nation against the other, on account of religion, passed in an island at that time little known by other nations, and had not the authority of such illustrious accomplices as a Catharine de Medicis, a king of France, and a duke of Guise: the victims of this brutal zeal, though equal in number, were not of such consideration

consideration as those in France. The scene was to the full as bloody, but the theatre of action did not fix the attention of Europe. The whole world still rings with the horrors of St. Bartholomew's day, while the Irish massacre is in a manner forgotten.

If we were to reckon the murders which have been committed by enthusiasm, since the disputes of Athanasius and Arius, to the present time, we should find that those disputes have contributed more to the depopulation of the earth, than all the battles that have been fought; for in the latter, the male species only is destroyed, which is always more numerous than the female; whereas in the massacres perpetrated for religion's sake, both sexes are indiscriminately made the victims. While one part of the people of Ireland were thus employed in extirpating the other, Charles I. was in Scotland, where tranquillity was scarce restored; while the house of commons took upon them the government of England. The Irish Roman catholics, in order to justify this massacre, pretended to have a commission from the king himself to take up arms; so that while Charles was asking succours of Scotland and England against the Irish rebels, he saw himself accused of the very crime which he wanted to punish. The Scotch with good reason referred him to the English parliament, because Ireland in fact was dependent on England, and not on Scotland. He therefore returned to London. The house of commons believing, or pretending to believe he had a share in the Irish rebellion, sent very little money and but few troops into that island, lest they should leave England exposed; but they made a terrible remonstrance to the king.

The purport was, "That henceforwards he must have
 " no other council but such as the parliament shall ap-
 " point; and in case of refusal, they threaten to take
 " other measures." Three members of the lower house presented this address to him on their knees, which in the main was declaring war against him. Oliver Cromwell who was at that time a member of the house of commons, said, "That if this motion for an
 " address

" address did not pass, he would sell what little estate he had, and retire out of England."

This speech shews that he was then an enthusiast for liberty, though his ambition afterwards induced him to trample it under his feet.

Charles durst not dissolve the parliament; they would not have obeyed him. He had still of his side a great many officers of the army, heretofore raised against Scotland, who constantly attended his person. He was also supported by the bishops, and by the catholic party about London, who had formerly aimed at exterminating the royal family by the gun-powder conspiracy, but were now entirely in the king's interest; every body else was against the king. The common people in London spirited up by the puritans of the house of commons, raised an insurrection in the city; and going to the door of the parliament house, they cried out, *no bishops, no bishops*. Twelve of the prelates withdrew through fear, and protested against the whole proceedings of parliament during their absence: the house of lords committed them to the Tower; and soon after the rest of the bishops retired from parliament.

In this decline of royal power, lord Digby, one of the king's favourites, gave him the fatal counsel of supporting his credit by an exertion of authority. The king forgot that this was the very time he ought not to have run any hazard of losing it. He went himself in person to the house of commons, in order to seize on five of the members who were his most violent opponents, and whom he charged with high treason. Those members had made their escape; and the house of commons loudly protested against the violation of their privileges. The king like a man that has lost his way and knows not where to turn, went from the house of commons to Guildhall, to demand succours. The common council answered him with complaints against himself. He retired to Windsor, and, unable to support the measure to which he had been advised, he wrote to the commons, " That he was ready to drop his proceedings against the members, and that he would

"take as much care of the privileges of parliament, as of his own life." His violence had made him odious, and now his submission rendered him contemptible.

The house of commons was then beginning to govern the state. The peers sit in parliament *of their own right*; this is the ancient privilege of the barons, and of the feudal lords: the commons are in parliament, as representatives of the towns and boroughs, by which they are elected. The people had a great deal more confidence in their deputies than in the peers. The latter to recover their influence which was gradually declining, joined in the same sentiments with the people, and maintained the authority of a parliament, of which they originally constituted the principal branch.

During this state of anarchy, the Irish rebels were triumphant, and after embruing their hands in the blood of their countrymen, they sheltered themselves under the authority of the king, and especially of the queen his wife, who was a Roman catholic. The two houses proposed to arm the militia of the kingdom, intending always that it should be commanded by officers dependent on the parliament. By the laws of the realm, nothing could be done in regard to the militia, without the king's consent. The parliament expected of course that he would refuse to sign a regulation made against himself. The king retired, or rather fled to the north of England. His wife, Henrietta of France, daughter of Henry IV. possessed of all the qualities, the activity, the intrepidity, the winning deportment, and even the gallantry of the king her father, acted as an heroine in assisting a husband, to whom in other respects she was unfaithful. She sold her effects and her jewels, and borrowed money in England and Holland, which she gave over to her husband. After this she went over to Holland herself, in order to solicit succours by means of the princess Mary her daughter, who was married to the prince of Orange. She negotiated at the northern courts; and sought every where for relief, except in her native

native country, where cardinal Richelieu her enemy, and the king her brother, were a dying.

The civil war was not yet declared. The parliament had of their own authority appointed Sir John Hotham governor of Hull, a small sea-port town in Yorkshire. This place had magazines of arms and provisions. The king appeared before the town, and wanted to enter it. Hotham shut the gates; but still preserving a shew of respect for his sovereign, kneeled down on the ramparts and asked pardon for refusing him admittance. Charles afterwards met with those who treated him with less ceremony. England swarmed with manifestos and declarations from both king and parliament. The lords of the king's party attended his person. He sent to London for the great seal of England, without which the nation used to think there could be no law; yet the parliament found means to publish the acts which they made against him. He set up his royal standard at Nottingham; but only a few militia flocked to him in the beginning. At length what with the succours brought him by the queen his consort, with the presents from the university of Oxford, who gave him all her plate, and with the supplies from his friends, he mustered up an army of about fourteen thousand men.

The parliament, having the disposal of the public money, raised a more considerable force. Charles began with protesting, in the presence of his army, "That he would maintain the laws of the realm, and even the privileges of the parliament that had revolted against him; and that he would live and die in the true protestant religion." Thus it is that princes, in matters of religion, are more under subjection to their people, than the people to them. When once what we call dogma, or an opinion, has gotten root in a nation, the sovereign must declare that he is ready to die for that opinion. It is much easier to make such a speech than to persuade the multitude.

The king's troops were generally commanded by prince Rupert, son of Frederick the unfortunate elector Palatine; a prince of great courage, and celebrated also for his

knowledge in natural philosophy, in which he made some discoveries.

- 1642 The battles of Worcester and Edgehill were favourable to the royal cause. The king drew towards London: the queen, having brought him troops, artillery, arms, and ammunition from Holland, went back for fresh supplies, with which she arrived some months afterwards. In the courageous activity of this princess it was easy to distinguish the daughter of Henry IV. The parliament were not dismayed; they knew their resources, and notwithstanding their defeat, they behaved like sovereigns against whom the king was in rebellion.

Whosoever offered to deliver up any place to the king, was condemned to death by the parliament for high-treason; yet the king would make no reprisals against his prisoners. This alone may justify, in the eye of posterity, the prince who was so criminal in the eye of his people. He is not so well justified in politics for having spent too much time in negotiating, while he should have profited by his first success, and exerted that active intrepidity, by which alone such disputes can be decided.

- 1643 Charles and prince Rupert, though beaten at Newbury, had the advantage upon the whole of the campaign. The parliament only grew more obstinate. It was very extraordinary that a senate, or popular assembly, should pursue their purpose with more steadiness and resolution, than a king at the head of his army.

At length the puritans, who were predominant in both houses, pulled off the mask: they solemnly joined with the Scotch, and signed the famous covenant, whereby they engaged to demolish episcopacy. By this covenant it was visible, that the Scotch and English puritans wanted to form themselves into a republic. This was the spirit of calvinism; the professors of that sect had long aimed at such a revolution in France; they brought it to pass in Holland; but in France and England there was no possibility of attaining an end so agreeable to the people, without wading through rivers of blood.

While

While the presbyterians were thus up in arms in England and Scotland, the catholic religion served as a pretence to the Irish rebels, who had stained their hands in the blood of forty thousand of their countrymen, and continued to defend themselves against the troops which the parliament sent over from England. The religious wars under Louis XIII. were still recent; and the invasion of Germany by the Swedes, under pretence of religion, was an example before their eyes. It is a most deplorable thing that Christians should, for such a succession of ages, have derived pretences from the doctrine, worship, discipline, and hierarchy of their religion, to render those parts of Europe, where they were settled, a scene of perpetual slaughter and confusion.

The fury of the civil war was fomented by that gloomy and unrelenting austerity, which the puritans constantly affected. The parliament took this opportunity to burn, by the hands of the common hangman, a small book of king James I. wherein that learned monarch maintained the lawfulness of diverting one's self on Sundays after divine service. They imagined hereby to promote the cause of religion, and to affront the prince on the throne. Some time after this, the same parliament thought proper to ordain a fast-day once a week, and that the value of the meal retrenched, should go towards defraying the expences of the civil war.

Of the numberless dissensions which have at different times threatened the subversion of the English government, before it acquired the happy and settled form in which we now see it, the troubles of those times preceding the death of Charles I. were the only ones in which excess of folly and excess of madness were combined together. The religious superstition, with which the reformed sect had so often reproached those of the Romish communion, might now be retorted upon the puritans. The bishops behaved like cowards; they ought to have died in defence of a cause which they thought just: but the behaviour of the presbyterians was that of madmen; their dress, their conversation,

their low allusions to passages of scripture, their ridiculous gestures, their sermons, their pretended prophecies; in short, the whole of their manners might, in more peaceable times, have served to divert the mob at Bartholomew fair, had they not been rather too disgusting. But, unhappily, these fanatics joined fury to absurdity; and those whom children now a-days would laugh to scorn, by imbruing themselves with blood, filled the nation with terror, and were at once the most ridiculous and the most formidable of men.

We must not suppose that in those factions, either in England, Ireland, or Scotland, whether among the royalists, or their enemies, there were many of those artful men, who free from the prejudices of party, made the errors and fanaticism of the multitude subservient to their own ambitious purposes. This was not the disposition of those people. Almost every body was sincerely engaged in the party he had embraced. Most of those who changed sides on the account of particular pique or discontent, did it openly. The independents were the only persons that concealed their design; in the first place, because being hardly considered as Christians, they would have given too great offence to the other sects; secondly, they had fanatic notions of the original equality of mankind, a system extremely repugnant to the ambitious views of the rest.

A striking proof, among others, of that inflexible rigour, which had soured the minds of the people, was the execution of William Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, who after being four years in prison, was at length condemned by parliament. The only crime alleged against him, that could be fairly proved, was his having made use of several ceremonies of the Romish communion, in consecrating a church at London. The sentence pronounced against him was to be hanged, drawn and quartered, the ordinary punishment of traitors: but they did him the favour to cut off his head.

Charles,

Charles, perceiving the parliaments of England and Scotland united against him, and finding himself hard pressed between the armies of both kingdoms, thought it advisable to conclude a truce with the rebel catholics of Ireland, in order to bring over part of the English troops employed in that island. This policy succeeded. His army was not only increased with numbers of the English that served in that country, but likewise by a great many Irish. Upon this the parliament loudly accused him of being the author of the Irish massacre and rebellion. Unfortunately these new troops, on which he greatly depended, were defeated by sir Thomas 1644 Fairfax, one of the parliament's generals; so that the king had only the vexation of giving his enemies a colour to charge him with being an accomplice of the Irish.

One misfortune followed close upon another. Prince 1644 Rupert, having long maintained the honour of the royal arms, was beaten in the neighbourhood of York, and his army dispersed by Manchester and Fairfax. Charles retired to Oxford, where he was soon besieged. The queen fled to France. The danger the king was reduced to, excited his friends to make further efforts. The siege of Oxford was raised. Charles got together a few troops, and met with some success; but this did not continue long. The parliament was ever in a condition to oppose him with a superior army. Their generals, Essex, Manchester and Waller, attacked Charles at Newbury, upon the road to Oxford. Oa. Cromwell was colonel in their army, and had already 27, signalized himself by extraordinary feats of valour. It 1644 is reported, that at this very battle of Newbury, the wing commanded by Manchester having given way, and Manchester himself going with the tide, Cromwell, wounded as he was, ran up to him, and said, "You are mistaken, my lord, the enemy are not that way;" upon which he brought him back; so that the success of the day was chiefly owing to Cromwell. This however is certain, that Cromwell, who began to have as much credit in the house of commons, as he had reputation

putation in the army, accused the general of neglect of duty.

The natural propensity of the English to things uncommon and extraordinary, produced at that time an odd phenomenon, which displayed the character of Cromwell, at the same time that it laid the foundation of his grandeur, of the ruin of the parliament and episcopacy, of the murder of the king, and the destruction of the monarchy. The sect of independents began to make some noise. The most violent presbyterians had thrown themselves into this party: they resembled the quakers inasmuch as they would have no priests but themselves; and no other interpretation of the gospel, than their own natural sense; but they differed in this, that they were full as turbulent as the quakers were pacific. Their chimerical project was that of equality among mankind; but they were for establishing this equality by violence. Oliver Cromwell looked upon these people as proper tools for promoting his designs.

The city of London, being divided into several factions, complained that the parliament laid the whole burthen of the civil war upon her shoulders. Cromwell caused a proposal to be made to the house of commons by some independents, of new modelling the army, and of engaging both lords and commons to renounce all civil and military employments. These were all at that time possessed by members of both houses. Three peers were generals of the parliamentary armies. Most of the colonels and majors, commissaries of stores, and agents of all sorts, were of the house of commons. Would one think it possible to persuade, by strength of words, such a number of men in power to sacrifice their dignities and their emoluments? And yet this is what was effected in one single session. The house of commons especially was struck with the idea of reigning
1645 over the hearts of the people, by a disinterestedness beyond example. This act was called *the self-denying ordinance*. The peers hesitated; but the house of commons dragged them into it. The lords Essex, Den-

high,

high, Fairfax and Manchester resigned their commissions of their own accord; and sir Thomas Fairfax, the general's son, not being a member of the house of commons, was nominated to the sole command of the army. This was what Cromwell wanted: he had an absolute ascendant over sir Thomas; and so great was his influence in the house, that they suffered him to keep the command of a regiment, though he was member of parliament: they even ordered the general to entrust him with the command of the horse, which they were then sending to Oxford. The same man, who had so artfully deprived the members of both houses of their military employments, had the policy to continue all the officers of the independent party; and then it quickly appeared that the army must govern the parliament. The new general Fairfax, with Cromwell's assistance, new modelled the army, incorporated some regiments into others, changed the different corps, and established a new discipline. What at any other time would have occasioned a mutiny, was done now without the least resistance.

The army, animated with a new spirit, marched directly towards the king in the neighbourhood of Oxford; and soon after was fought the decisive battle of Naseby. Cromwell, general of the horse, after routing June the royal cavalry, returned and put the infantry also to flight, so that he had almost the sole honour of that famous day. The royal army, after great slaughter, was either taken or dispersed. All the towns surrendered to Fairfax and to Cromwell. The young prince of Wales, afterwards Charles II. sharing betimes his father's misfortunes, was obliged to fly to the little island of Scilly. The king retired to Oxford with the shattered remains of his army, and sued to his parliament for peace, which they would not grant. The house of commons insulted him in his disgrace. The general had sent them the king's cabinet of papers, found on the field of battle, containing letters from his queen. Some of those letters, fraught with expressions of ten-

der sorrow, were read in the house with that bitter raillery, which is ever the characteristic of cruel minds.

The king was then at Oxford, a city hardly to be called fortified, between the victorious army of the English, and the Scotch army in English pay. Thinking he should be safer among the latter, who were less incensed against his person, he surrendered himself to the Scotch army. But, the house of commons having paid the Scotch two hundred thousand pounds of their arrears, and being indebted to them as much more, the king from that moment ceased to be free.

The Scotch delivered the king up to the commissaries of the English parliament, who at first did not know how to behave towards their captive king. The war seemed to be at an end; the Scotch army had taken their money, and were going back to their own country; and the parliament had nothing to fear but their own forces, which had rendered them victorious. But here Cromwell and the independents were predominant. This parliament, or rather the house of commons, being still all powerful at London, and perceiving that the army was likely to be uppermost, wanted to get rid of those servants who were become so dangerous; and therefore they voted that part of the forces should be sent to Ireland, and part disbanded. It is easy to imagine that Cromwell would not suffer this. This was the critical moment: he formed a council of officers, and another of common soldiers called *agitators*, who at first made remonstrances, and afterwards gave the law. The king was in the hands of commissioners of the parliament, at a place called Holmby-house in Northamptonshire, a detachment of horse, from the council of *agitators*, went and seized upon his person, and conveyed him to Newmarket.

After this bold stroke the army marched towards London. Cromwell, chusing to colour his acts of violence with the usual forms, made the army impeach eleven members, who were declared enemies of the independent party. Those members withdrew, and durst no more appear in the house of commons. The city of

London

London at length opened her eyes, when it was too late, and saw a scene of the highest misery: a tyrannical parliament tyrannized in its turn by the army; her captive king in the hands of the soldiery; and herself at their mercy. The common-council assembled the militia, and caused entrenchments to be thrown up in a hurry about the town: but as soon as the army arrived, London opened her gates, and was silent. The parliament delivered up the Tower to general Fairfax, thanked the 1647 army for disobeying their orders, and gave them money.

It remained still to know what was to be done with the captive king, whom the independents had removed to the royal palace at Hampton-court. Cromwell on the one hand, and the presbyterians on the other, were treating with him. The Scotch made a proposal to rescue him from his confinement. Charles equally afraid of all parties, made his escape from Hampton-court, and got over to the isle of Wight, where he thought he should find an asylum; but he only changed his prison.

During this anarchy of a factious despicable parliament, of a capital divided, of an audacious army, and of a captive fugitive king, the same spirit which had long animated the independents, seized all of a sudden on several soldiers of the army, who took the name of *levellers*, signifying that they wanted to bring every thing to an equality, and to acknowledge no superior at all, either in the army, state, or church. In this they were for doing no more than what the house of commons had done: they were imitating their officers; their right seemed to be as well founded as that of any of the rest; and their number was considerable. Cromwell, perceiving that these people were so much the more dangerous, as they made use of his own principles, and that they were going to rob him of the fruit of all his toil and politics, took a sudden resolution to exterminate them, even at the risk of his life. One day, as they 1647 were assembled, he rode up to them at the head of his own regiment, with whom he had been ever victorious, and asking them in *the name of God* what they would be at, he charged them so briskly, that they scarce made

any resistance. Several of them he ordered to be hanged; whereby he suppressed a faction, whose crime was that of having imitated his example.

This behaviour strengthened his authority in the army, as well as in parliament, and in the city of London. Fairfax was still general, but had not near so much credit as Cromwell. The king, under confinement in the isle of Wight, continued to make proposals of peace, as if the war still subsisted, and his enemies were inclined to hear him. His second son, the duke of York, who was afterwards king James II. then only fifteen years of age, and a prisoner in St. James's palace, made his escape with more success than his father had done from Hampton-court; and went to Holland: some of the king's adherents, having gained over part of the navy of England, sailed to the Brill in Holland, to which port this young prince had retired. His brother the prince of Wales, and he, went on board the fleet, in order to succour their father; but this very step hastened his ruin.

The Scotch, ashamed of being reproached all over Europe with having sold their master, were assembling some troops in his favour. Several young noblemen were ready to join them in England. Cromwell marched against them with part of the army, and defeated them 1648 intirely at Preston, where he took duke Hamilton, the Scotch general, prisoner. The town of Colchester, in the county of Essex, having joined with the royalists, was obliged to surrender at discretion to general Fairfax; who ordered several persons of condition to be executed, for having encouraged the town to defend the cause of their sovereign.

While Fairfax and Cromwell were every where triumphant, the parliament more afraid of Cromwell and the independents than they had been of the king, began to treat with his majesty, and to think how they should get rid of an army, on which they were more dependent than ever. The army, after a series of victories, being returned to London, insisted that the king should be brought to justice, as the cause of all the calamities

lamities of the nation; that his chief adherents should be punished; and his children ordered to submit to parliament, upon pain of being declared guilty of high treason. The parliament made no answer. Cromwell caused all the officers of his army to present remonstrances to him, that the king might be brought to his trial. General Fairfax who was so blind as not to see that he was acting for Cromwell, removed the captive monarch from the isle of Wight to Hurst castle, and from thence to Windsor, without so much as acquainting the parliament. The army marched up to London, seized on all the posts, and obliged the city to pay them forty thousand pound sterling.

The next day the house of commons were going to meet; but they found the door guarded by soldiers, who drove away most of the presbyterian members, the original authors of all the miseries of the kingdom, which now fell heavy upon themselves; none were suffered to enter but independents, and rigid presbyterians, the implacable enemies of royalty. The excluded members protested; and their protest was declared to be seditious. The remaining members of the house of commons were chiefly citizens devoted to the army. The officers in the house lorded it without controul; the city was brought into the same subjection; and the common council, who lately espoused the king's cause, being now directed by their conquerors, presented a remonstrance requiring him to be brought to justice.

The house of commons appointed a committee of thirty eight persons, to consider how to proceed juridically against the king. They erected a new court of justice, composed of Fairfax, Cromwell, Ireton, Cromwell's son-in-law, Waller, and a hundred and forty-seven other commissioners. A few peers, who still met in the house of lords only for form, the rest having withdrawn, were summoned to give their attendance at this illegal assembly; but not one of them would consent to it. Their refusal however did not hinder the new court of justice from proceeding.

Upon this the commons resolved that the supreme power resides originally in the people; and that their representatives are invested with the legislative authority. This was a question which the army determined by the mouths of a few citizens: but it was subverting the constitution of England. The nation indeed is legally represented by the house of commons; but it is so likewise by the king and the house of lords. Other countries have constantly complained, against the appointing of commissioners to try private subjects: and here a commission was issued by the least considerable part of a parliament, to try their sovereign. There is no sort of doubt but the commons thought they had a right to try him; the house was composed chiefly of independents, who were of opinion that nature made no difference betwixt them and the king, and that the only disparity then subsisting was that of the victorious over the conquered. The papers left by Ludlow, a colonel in the army, and one of the judges, shew how greatly their pride was flattered, at having it in their power to condemn their former master. This same Ludlow, a rigid presbyterian, leaves no room to doubt, but fanaticism had a share in this catastrophe. He fully discloses the spirit of the times by quoting this passage of the Old Testament: "The country cannot be purified from blood, but by the blood of him who spilt it."

Jan. 1648 At length Fairfax, Cromwell, the independents, and the presbyterians, thought the king's death necessary for their purpose of establishing a republic. Cromwell surely could not flatter himself at that time with the notion of succeeding the king; he was only a lieutenant-general in an army divided into factions. In such an army, and in a republican government, he might expect, and with good reason, a reputation from his exploits, and from his ascendancy over the army. But had he then formed a design to be acknowledged sovereign of three kingdoms, he would not have deserved it. The human mind, in all kinds of pursuits, proceeds by degrees; and these degrees insensibly led to Cromwell's advancement,

advancement, for which he was indebted only to his valour, and to fortune.

Charles I. king of Scotland, England and Ireland, Jan. died by the hands of a public executioner, before White-^{30,} hall; his body was carried to Windsor chapel, where it¹⁶⁴⁸ could never be found. More than one king of England had been deposed by acts of parliament: the wives of kings had been publicly executed: English commissioners had pronounced sentence of death on Mary queen of Scotland, over whom they had no more authority than a gang of banditti: but no instance was remembered of a nation bringing their king to the scaffold with the formality of justice. We must ascend three hundred years higher than our æra, to find in the person of Agis king of Sparta, an example of a similar catastrophe.

C H A P. CLXXXI.

Of C R O M W E L L.

AFTER the murder of Charles I. the house of commons published an act to prohibit, upon pain of death, the acknowledging his son or any other person as king of England. They abolished the upper house, which had been reduced to sixteen peers; so that they remained in all appearance, sovereigns of England and Ireland.

But this house, which should have consisted of five hundred and thirteen members, was at that time composed only of fourscore. They made a new great seal, on which were engraved these words: *the parliament of the commonwealth of England*. They had already pulled down the king's statue on the Royal Exchange, and put this inscription in its stead: "Charles the last king, and "the first tyrant."

The same house of commons caused several lords to be put to death, who had been taken fighting for their king.

king. It was not at all surprizing that they should break through the rules of war, after having violated the laws of nations; and in order to make the breach more notorious, the duke of Hamilton, a Scotchman, was one of the condemned. This behaviour contributed greatly to determine the Scotch to acknowledge Charles II. for their king: but the love of liberty was so deeply engraved in their hearts, that they laid the
 1649 same restriction on the royal authority, as the English parliament had done at the beginning of the troubles. Ireland acknowledged the new king without any conditions. Cromwell contrived to be appointed lord-governor of that island, for which he embarked with the flower of his troops, and met with his usual success.

In the mean while Charles II. was invited to Scotland by the parliament of that nation, but upon the same terms as they had prescribed to the king his father. They insisted on his becoming a presbyterian; as the Parisians had insisted that his grandfather Henry IV. should turn Roman catholic. They cramped the royal authority in every thing; and Charles would have it perfect and intire. The fate of his father had not weakened those ideas, which seem to be innate in monarchs. The first fruit of his being called to the throne of Scotland, was a civil war. The marquis of Montrose, a nobleman celebrated in those days for his attachment to the royal family, and for his valour, had landed in the north of Scotland with a few soldiers from Germany and Denmark; and being followed by some highlanders, he was for asserting the king's rights by conquest: but he was defeated, taken prisoner, and sentenced by the Scotch parliament to be hanged upon a gallows thirty feet high, to be afterwards quartered, and his members fixed upon the gates of the four principal towns in Scotland, for having offended against the *new law or covenant*, as it was called. This brave nobleman, upon hearing his sentence pronounced to him by the judge, made answer, "That he was sorry he had
 "not quarters enough to be sent to the gates of every
 "town in Europe, as monuments of his fidelity to his
 "prince.

"prince." He even put this sentiment into tolerable verse as he was going to the place of execution. He was a person of the most agreeable wit, and the most learning, as well as the bravest man of any in the three kingdoms. The presbyterian clergy accompanied him to his execution, reviling and insulting him, and pronouncing his damnation.

Charles II. having no other resource, went over from 1650 Holland to resign himself into the hands of those, who had but just hanged his general and chief support; he made his entry into Edinburgh, through the very gate where Montrose's quarters were set up.

The parliament of England immediately prepared to make war against Scotland, not chusing that one half of the island should have a king who pretended to the other. This new commonwealth shewed as much conduct in supporting the revolution, as they had given marks of enthusiastic madness in effecting it. It was amazing to all the world, that a few obscure citizens, without any great personage to head them, should exclude the peers of the realm from their seats in parliament, strip the bishops of their privileges, contain the people within bounds, maintain an army of about sixteen thousand men in Ireland, and as many in England, support a large and well provided fleet, discharge every branch of the public revenue with the utmost exactness, while not one member of the house of commons enriched himself at the expence of the nation. In order to answer all these exigencies, they applied with the most scrupulous œconomy, the revenue heretofore annexed to the crown, and the lands belonging to the bishops and chapters, which were sold for ten years. In a word, the nation paid a tax of one hundred and twenty thousand pounds sterling per month, a tax ten times heavier than that duty of ship money which Charles I. had usurped, and which had been the cause of so many disasters.

This English parliament was not governed by Cromwell, who was then in Ireland with his son-in-law Ireton; but by the independents, with whom he was still

in high credit. The parliament resolved to send an army into Scotland, and to make Cromwell serve under general Fairfax. Cromwell received orders to quit Ireland, when he had very near subdued the island. General Fairfax, who was not an independent, but a presbyterian, refused to march against the Scotch. He pretended that he could not in conscience fight against his brethren, who had made no attack upon England. Their arguments had no effect with him; so that he laid down his commission, to pass the remainder of his days in peace. This revolution was by no means extraordinary, at a time, and in a country in which each man acted according to his own private principles.

From hence we may date the æra of Cromwell's greatness; who was named general in Fairfax's stead.
 June 1650 He marched into Scotland with an army, that during ten years had been accustomed to victory. He began with beating the Scotch at Dunbar, and made himself master of Edinburgh. From thence he followed Charles II. who had advanced as far as Worcester, in hopes that the English royalists would join him; but this prince's troops were new raised and undisciplined. Cromwell Sept. 13, attacked him on the banks of the Severn, and after a short resistance obtained a most complete victory. About 1650 seven thousand prisoners were brought up to London, N. S. and sold to the American plantations. This I believe is the first instance of men being sold for slaves among christians, since the abolition of slavery. The victorious army became masters of all Scotland; and Cromwell followed close in pursuit of the king.

Imagination, the parent of romance, has scarce invented more extraordinary adventures, more pressing dangers, more cruel hardships than those which Charles II. underwent, flying from the murderer of his father. Exposed to hunger and fatigue, he was obliged to walk almost alone through unfrequented paths, as far as Staffordshire. Pursued by Cromwell's soldiers, he hid himself in a hollow oak in the midst of a wood, where he spent a whole day and night. This oak was still existing at the beginning of this century. Astronomers
 & have

have placed it among the constellations of the south pole, thus eternizing the memory of this prince's misfortunes. Charles, after wandering from village to village, disguised in different forms, of a post boy, of a Nov. young girl, and of a wood cleaver, made his escape at 1650 length on board a small vessel, and landed in Normandy after having experienced during six weeks a series of incredible adventures.

In the mean time, Cromwell returned triumphant to London. Most of the members of parliament, and the speaker at their head, with the lord mayor and common council, went to meet him some miles from the capital. His first care, as soon as he came to town, was to persuade the parliament to make a wrong use of a victory, that had been extremely flattering to the English nation. They united Scotland, as a country ^{or} subdued by their arms, to England; and the regal dig- 1650 nity was abolished among the conquered, after the example set by the conquerors.

Never did England make a more glorious figure, than while it was a commonwealth. This republican parliament formed a very odd project of joining the seven United Provinces to England, in the same manner as 1652 they had united Scotland. William II. stadtholder, and son-in-law of Charles I. had died lately, after attempting to make himself absolute master in Holland, as Charles had attempted in England, and with no better success. He left a son in the cradle: the parliament were therefore in hopes that the Dutch would conduct affairs without a stadtholder, as England conducted herself now without a king; and that the new republic of England, Scotland, and Holland would hold the balance of Europe. But the partisans of the house of Orange having opposed this project, which seemed to favour greatly of the enthusiastic spirit of the times, this same enthusiasm induced the English parliament to declare war against Holland. The fleets of both nations engaged at sea with alternate success. The most zealous republicans in parliament, apprehensive of Cromwell's great authority, continued this war, merely to have a

pretext for increasing the fleet, and reducing the army, that the dangerous power of the general might be gradually destroyed.

Cromwell saw into their designs, as they did into his: and then it was that he threw off all disguise. "I am forced," said he to major general Vernon, "to take a step, which makes the very hair of my head stand April 30, 1653 of an end." He went to the house attended by a few officers and a file of musketeers, who planted themselves at the door. After he was seated. "I think," N. S. said he, "this parliament is ripe for a dissolution." Some of the members reproaching him with ingratitude, he stood up and said, "The Lord hath done with you; he has chosen other instruments for carrying on his work." After this fanatic speech, he loaded them with the vilest language, telling one that he was a drunkard, another that he led a scandalous life, such as the gospel condemns, and that they should dissolve that instant. The soldiers with their officers entering the house, "take away the mace," said he, "that fool's bauble." Major general Harrison went up to the speaker, and pulled him out of the chair. "You have forced me to this," said Cromwell; "I have sought the Lord night and day, that he would rather slay me, than put me upon this work." Having said these words, he ordered the members to walk out one after the other; then he locked the door himself, and put the key into his pocket.

What is much more extraordinary is, that though the parliament was annihilated in this furious manner, and an end put to all legislative power, yet no confusion ensued. Cromwell called a council of officers. It was they that really changed the constitution of England; and what happened in that country was no more than what hath been practised in every other part of the world, where the strong have given laws to the weak. Cromwell made this council nominate a hundred and forty deputies of the people, the greatest part of them low mechanics. One of the most active members of this new parliament of England, was a leather-seller, named

Barebone;

Barebone; which was the reason of giving to this assembly the denomination of *Barebone's parliament*. Cromwell, in quality of general, wrote a circular letter to all those deputies; convoking them to come and govern England, Scotland and Ireland. At the end of five months this pretended parliament, composed of persons equally ignorant and contemptible, were obliged to dissolve themselves, and to resign the supreme power into the hands of the council of war. The officers declared Cromwell protector of the three kingdoms. The lord mayor and court of aldermen were sent for; and Cromwell was installed in the royal palace at Whitehall, where he took up his residence. They^{Dec.} gave him the title of highness; and the city of^{22,} London invited him to a feast with the same honours¹⁶⁵³ as had been heretofore paid to their monarchs. Thus^{N. S.} did a private gentleman of the county of Huntingdon raise himself to be king under another name, by his valour and hypocrisy.

Cromwell was then near fifty-three years of age, and had lived till he was forty-two without any employment, civil or military. He was scarce known in 1642, when the house of commons, of which he was a member, gave him a commission of major of horse. Thence he rose to govern both the parliament and the army. After conquering Charles I. and Charles II. he ascended the throne in reality, and reigned without the title of king, but with more authority and success than any monarch. He began his administration with choosing from among the officers, who had been companions of his victories, a council of fourteen, to each of whom he allowed a salary of a thousand pounds a year. The troops were always paid a month before hand; the magazines were filled; there was a reserve of three hundred thousand pounds in the exchequer, which was at his disposal; and he had a hundred and fifty thousand pounds in Ireland. The Dutch sued to him for peace, which he granted on condition that they should pay him three hundred thousand pounds sterling; that their ships should strike their flag before the English; and that the young prince of Orange should

never

never be restored to the employments of his ancestors. It was this same prince of Orange that afterwards dethroned king James II. as Cromwell had dethroned his father.

Foreign nations vied with each other in paying their court to the protector. France sought his alliance against Spain, and put him in possession of the town of Dunkirk*. His fleets drove the Spaniards out of Jamaica, which has ever since been in the possession of England. Ireland was entirely reduced, and treated like a conquered province. The Irish estates were given to the victors; and those who were most zealous in the defence of their country, perished by the hands of the executioner.

Cromwell governed the realm with the authority of a king. He summoned parliaments, which were intirely at his disposal, and he dissolved them whenever he pleased. He discovered every plot that was formed
1656 against him, and prevented insurrections. No peer ever sat in any of his parliaments; they all lived in obscurity upon their estates. He had the artifice to engage one of those parliaments to offer him the title of king, that he might have the opportunity of refusing it, and be the better enabled to preserve his real power. He led a gloomy life in the palace of the English kings, without pomp or luxury. General Ludlow, his deputy in Ireland, relates, that the protector sent his son Henry to that kingdom, with one domestic only. His manners were severe; he was sober and temperate; an œconomist without desiring the property of others, laborious and diligent in all his affairs. He was particularly dextrous in managing all sects whatever, neither persecuting the catholics nor those of the church of England, who at that time durst hardly shew their faces: he had chaplains of all parties; he was an enthusiast when in company with fanatics; he supported the presbyterians, when he was no longer afraid of that sect, though he had deceived and crushed them before; but he placed his confidence only in the independents,

* See *The Age of Louis XIV.* V.

who could not subsist but through him; and yet he would sometimes laugh at them with the deists. Not that he looked upon deism with a favourable eye; for this being a religion void of enthusiasm, and consequently fit only for philosophers, can never be of service to conquerors.

There were but a few of this philosophic sect in the kingdom, and with these he would sometimes divert himself at the expence of the holy madmen, who had cleared the way for him to the throne with the bible in their hands. By this conduct he preserved to his last hour an authority which had been cemented with blood, and supported by fraud and violence.

Nature, notwithstanding his sobriety, had fixed the ^{Sept.} period of his days at fifty-eight. He died of a common ^{13,} fever, probably the effect of tyrannical inquietude: ¹⁶⁵⁸ for the latter part of his life he was always afraid of being assassinated, and would never lie two nights successively in the same chamber. He died, after nominating his son, Richard Cromwell, to succeed him in the protectorship. No sooner was the breath out of his body, than one of his chaplains, a presbyterian, whose name was Herry, said to the standers by; "Do not be uneasy, since he protected God's people while he was among us below, he will surely protect them much more, now that he is mounted to heaven, where he must be seated at Christ's right hand." Such was the power of fanaticism, and so great was Cromwell respected, that no body laughed at this speech.

Notwithstanding the different interests by which the minds of the people were divided, Richard Cromwell was peaceably proclaimed protector in London. The council ordered a more magnificent funeral for his father, than had been ever seen at the death of any king. For their model they pitched upon the solemnities exhibited at the interment of Philip II. king of Spain. It is observable, that Philip had been represented in purgatory two months, in an apartment hung with black, and lighted with a few torches: afterwards they

they represented him in heaven, the body lying on a bed embroidered with gold, in a hall hung with the same, illuminated with five hundred torches, which, being reflected by silver plates, cast a light that rivalled the resplendency of the sun. All this was punctually imitated for Oliver Cromwell; he was laid on a bed of state, with the crown on his head, and a golden sceptre in his hand. The people took no notice of this imitation of a popish ceremony, nor of the extravagant expence. The body was embalmed, and interred in Henry the Seventh's chapel among the kings of England; whence it was afterwards dug up, and buried under the gallows in the reign of Charles II.

C H A P. CLXXXII.

Of England under Charles II.

RICHARD CROMWELL, the second protector, not having the abilities of his father, could not expect his success: his sceptre was not supported by the sword; and, as he had neither the bravery nor the hypocrisy of Oliver, he could neither command respect from the army, nor impose upon the parties and sects into which England was at that time divided. Oliver's council of war began with acting in defiance to Richard. This new protector pretended to strengthen his interest by calling a parliament, where one house, composed of officers, should represent the peers of England, and the other, formed of English, Scotch, and Irish deputies, should represent the three kingdoms. But the leading men of the army obliged him to dissolve this assembly. The next thing they did was to restore the old parliament which had beheaded Charles I. and which Oliver Cromwell had so imperiously dissolved. The members of this parliament were all republicans, as well as the army. They would have no king; nor would they have a protector. This parliament, which
was

was called the *rump parliament*, seemed to be enthusiasts for liberty, equally detesting the names of king and protector, of bishops and peers; never speaking but in the name of the people, merely to hold them the more easily in subjection. The officers drew up an address to this parliament of their own making, requesting that all the adherents of the royal family might be stripped of their employments for ever; and Richard Cromwell deprived of his protectorship. They treated him however honourably, desiring a pension of twenty thousand pounds a year for him, and eight thousand for his mother. The parliament refused to give him more than two thousand pounds, and ordered him to remove in six days from Whitehall. He obeyed, without complaining; and lived afterwards as a private person.

There was no mention made at that time either of peers or bishops. Charles II. seemed to be as much abandoned by all the world as Richard Cromwell; and most courts of Europe believed that the English commonwealth would still continue. The celebrated Monk, one of Cromwell's officers, was the person who restored the royal family. At that time he commanded the army in Scotland, which had subdued the country. The English parliament having resolved to break some officers of that army, this general determined to march into England, and to try his fortune. The three kingdoms were at that time in a state of anarchy. Part of Monk's army, which staid in Scotland, could not keep the people in subjection. The other, which followed Monk into England, had to deal with the troops of the republic. The parliament, apprehensive of both armies, wanted to have them under their command: so that there was danger of seeing all the horrors of civil war revived.

Monk, finding himself not powerful enough to succeed the two protectors, formed a scheme of restoring the royal family: but instead of spilling more blood, he embroiled the public affairs in such a manner by his negotiations, that he increased the anarchy, and brought

the nation to the point he aimed at, of wishing for the king. Scarce was there any blood spilt on this occasion. In vain did Lambert, one of Oliver's generals, and a most violent republican, endeavour to renew the war; before he could muster a sufficient number of Cromwell's veterans, he was prevented and taken prisoner by the troops under general Monk. A new parliament met. The peers, who had been so long excluded and forgotten, returned at length to their seats in parliament. The two houses acknowledged Charles II. for their king, and he was accordingly proclaimed
 May 8, 1660 in London.

Charles II. being thus recalled to England, without having contributed to this revolution otherwise than by his consent, and without having been obliged to submit to any conditions, set out from Breda, where he was then retired. The whole kingdom received him with acclamations; and it seemed as if there had been no civil war. The parliament ordered the bodies of Oliver Cromwell, Ireton his son-in-law, and Bradshaw, president of the high court of justice, to be dug up, and carried on a sledge to Tyburn, where they were buried under the gallows. Of the regicides, or judges who had sat on the trial of Charles I. only ten were executed: not one of them shewed the least repentance; not one would acknowledge the reigning king. They all thanked God, "For dying martyrs in the noblest and "best of causes." They were not only of the obstinate faction of the independents; but they followed the sect of anabaptists, who waited for the second coming of Christ, and for the fifth monarchy.

There were only nine bishops left in England; but the king soon filled up the number. The ancient order and forms were restored; while the pleasures and magnificence of a court succeeded the savage gloom, which so long had overspread the land. Charles II. introduced gallantry and entertainments into the palace of Whitehall, which had been stained with his father's blood. The independents appeared no more; the puritans were kept in awe. Such a change did the spirit

of the English nation receive, that the late civil war was burlesqued. Those four opinions, which had turned the brains of wild enthusiasts, were become the object of raillery at court, and among all young people.

Deism, which the king seemed openly to profess, became the reigning religion among the many others then in the kingdom, and has since made an amazing progress in other parts of the world. The earl of Shaftesbury, grandson to the minister, and one of the chief supporters of this sect, says positively in his *Characteristics*, "That the noble appellation of deist cannot be too highly respected." A great number of eminent writers have made open profession of deism; and the major part of the Socinians have ranged themselves under its standard. This sect, now become very numerous, is accused of admitting only the light of reason, and rejecting all revelation. It is not possible for a Christian to excuse their indolence: but the strict impartiality with which we are desirous to draw this great picture of human life, obliges us while we condemn their doctrine, to do justice to their behaviour. We cannot therefore but acknowledge, that this is the only sect of all others, that has not disturbed the peace of society by its disputes; and which, though erroneous, has been always clear of fanaticism. It is indeed, impossible that such a sect should be other than peaceable, since its followers are united with all mankind, in the principle common to all ages and all countries; namely, the worship of one only God; and differ from other men only in having no forms or places of worship; in believing only in one just God, allowing for the diversity of opinion in others, and seldom discovering their own. They say that their pure religion, which is as old as the world, was for a long time the only true one, before God himself gave another to the Hebrew nation. They found this notion from its having been always the religion of the Chinese literati; but these literati have a public form of worship, whereas the European deists have only a private one, every person worshipping God in his own house, and assisting with-

Dull

incor
at

out scruple at all public ceremonies: at least there has hitherto been but a very inconsiderable number of those called *Unitarians*, who have formed an assembly; but these stile themselves primitive Christians rather than deists.

The Royal Society of London, which had been already formed, but was not established by letters patent till the year 1660, began to polish the manners of the English, while it enlarged their understandings. Polite literature revived once more, and received daily improvements. In Cromwell's time they had scarce been acquainted with any other knowledge, or branch of learning, than that of applying texts of the Old and New Testament to public dissensions, and to the most horrid revolutions. But now they entered into the investigation of nature, and began to follow the road pointed out by lord Bacon. The mathematics were soon carried to a degree of perfection, which even Archimedes would not have expected. A great man at length discovered the fundamental laws of the general constitution of the universe; so that, while other nations were amusing themselves with fables, the English had the honour of unfolding truths of the greatest sublimity. The researches of several ages in physics, were nothing to the single discovery of the nature of light. The progress in twenty years was rapid and immense. This is a glory that will never fade. The fruit of genius and study is lasting; while the effects of ambition, fanaticism, and the passions, are destroyed with the times that gave them birth. The national genius, in the reign of Charles II. acquired immortal honour, though the government did not.

The French taste, which prevailed at court, was productive of gaiety and magnificence: but while it led the way to new customs and fashions, it produced a subjection to the interests of Louis XIV. Charles, having been long a pensioner to France, made the English sometimes regret the usurpation of Cromwell, when their nation was so greatly respected.

The

The parliaments of England and Scotland vied with each other, in granting the king all in their power, as a kind of reparation for the murder of his father. The English parliament in particular, which alone could render him powerful, allowed him a revenue of twelve hundred thousand pounds sterling, for himself and the several branches of the administration, independent of the service of the navy. Never had queen Elizabeth so much: yet Charles by his extravagance was always poor. The nation could not forgive his parting with Dunkirk for less than two hundred and forty thousand pounds; a place that had been acquired by the arms and negotiations of Cromwell.

The war he carried on, soon after the restoration, against the Dutch, was very expensive, since it cost the nation seven millions and a half sterling; and it was also ignominious, for admiral Ruyter sailed up the Medway, as far as Chatham, and burnt the English ships in the harbour.

The most terrible calamities were intermixed with these disasters. London was depopulated by a pestilence towards the beginning of this reign; and almost the whole town was destroyed by fire. This misfortune, coming just after the plague, and in the midst of an unsuccessful war with Holland, seemed irretrievable. Yet, to the astonishment of all Europe, in less than three years was London rebuilt, more beautiful, more regular and commodious than before. A single duty on coals, with the emulation of the citizens, was sufficient to execute this great undertaking. This is a strong instance of what human industry can achieve; and disposes us the more to believe the relations of those ancient cities of Asia and Egypt, that were built with such expedition.

But neither these calamities, nor the grand enterprise of rebuilding London, nor the war of 1672 against the Dutch, nor the cabals into which the court and parliament were divided, could abate the pleasures and gaiety, which Charles II. brought with him to England, as the growth of a country where he had resided several years.

years. A French mistress, French wit, and, above all, French money, prevailed at court.

Notwithstanding so many changes in the minds and affairs of the English, the love of liberty and faction did not change among the people; nor that passion for absolute power which prevailed in the king and his brother the duke of York; so that in the midst of the pleasures and festivities of a court, confusion, division, and animosities, between sects and parties, overspread the kingdom.

There were not indeed any violent civil wars, as in the time of Cromwell; but a series of intrigues, plots, and murders, committed under the solemn mask of justice, and in virtue of laws, which hatred, or party misapprehension, construed according to their own purpose, threw a cloud over a great part of the reign of Charles II. This prince indeed seemed, by the amiable mildness of his character, formed to render his people as happy as he made every one who had the honour of approaching him; and yet the blood of the subject flowed under the hand of the executioner, during this good prince's reign, as well as under those of others. Religion was the sole cause of these disasters, although the king himself was perfectly indifferent on that head.

He had no children, and his brother, who was presumptive heir to the crown, had turned papist, a name which is held in execration by the parliament and kingdom of England in general. As soon as it was positively known that the duke had changed his religion, the fear of having one day a papist for their king, made a change in almost all minds. Some wretches among the dregs of the people, hired by the faction that opposed the court, pretended to discover a plot much more extraordinary than that known by the name of gunpowder treason. They declared upon oath, that the papists had formed a design to murder the king, and place the crown upon his brother's head; that pope Clement X. in a congregation called *de Propaganda*, held in 1675, had declared, that the kingdom of England belonged to the popes, by an imprescriptible right; that, in vir-

tue

tue of this right, he had appointed Oliva, general of the order of Jesuits, his lieutenant there; and that this Jesuit had made over his authority to the duke of York, the pope's vassal; that an army was to be raised in England, to drive Charles II. from the throne; that father La Chaife, a Jesuit, and confessor to Louis XIV. had remitted ten thousand louis-d'ors to London, to set the operations on foot; that Conyers, another Jesuit, had bought a poniard, which cost him twenty shillings, with which he was to stab the king; and that a certain physician had been offered ten thousand pounds to poison him. At the same time they produced a list of the names and commissions of all the officers who had been nominated by the general of the Jesuits to serve in the army which was to be raised in defence of popery.

Never was accusation more absurd. The famous Irishman who pretended to see things fifty feet under ground; the rabbit woman or the bottle-conjurer in England, or with us the affair of the Bull Unigenitus, the convulsionists, and the charges brought against philosophers and men of learning, were not more ridiculous. But when once the minds of men come to be heated, the more preposterous an opinion is, the more it is credited.

The whole nation took the alarm. The parliament, in spite of all the endeavours of the court, proceeded in the most severe manner. There was some mixture of truth in these incredible falsehoods, and that was sufficient to sanctify the whole. The informers pretended that the Jesuit Oliva had appointed one Coleman, a dependent on the duke of York, his secretary of state in England. This Coleman's papers were seized, and some letters were found among them, written by him to father La Chaife, in which were the following expressions: "We have a great undertaking in hand, no less than the conversion of three kingdoms, and perhaps the total extirpation of heresy; we have a prince zealous in our cause, &c. . . . You must send a large sum of money to the king, money is the only prevailing logic at our court."

It

It seems evident by these letters that the Catholic party wanted to get the upper hand, that they had great dependence on the duke of York, and that the king himself was inclinable to favour the Catholics, provided they would supply him handsomely with money; and, lastly, that the Jesuits were doing all in their power to serve the pope in England. All the rest was manifestly false; and the informers contradicted themselves so grossly in their depositions, that at any other time they would have been laughed at by every one.

But Coleman's letters, and the murder of Sir Edmond-bury Godfrey which happened about that time, made any thing be believed of the papists. Several persons who were accused, lost their lives on the scaffold, and 1679 five Jesuits were hanged and quartered. Had these men been condemned as disturbers of the public peace, or for holding illicit correspondence, and endeavouring to subvert the religion by law established, their sentence would have been perfectly just; but certainly they ought not to have been put to death as captains or chaplains of a popish army, which was to have conquered the three kingdoms. The zeal against popery, however was carried so far, that the house of commons almost unanimously passed a bill of exclusion against the duke of York, by which he was declared for ever incapable of succeeding to the crown of England. This prince, a few years afterwards, did but too well confirm this sentence of the house of commons.

England, as well as all the North of Europe, one half of Germany, the seven United Provinces, and three-fourths of the Swiss cantons, had hitherto contented themselves with considering the Roman Catholic religion as idolatrous. But this obloquy had not passed into a law in any of these states. Now, however, the English parliament tacked the oath of abjuration to that of the test, and obliged the people to swear to their abhorrence of popery as an idolatrous religion.

What changes have happened in the human mind! The first Christians accused the Roman senate with paying adoration to statues, which they certainly did not.

The

The Christian religion continued three hundred years without images; twelve Christian emperors treated those as idolators who prayed before the pictures or figures of saints. This mode of worship was afterwards received both by the eastern and western churches, and after that held in abhorrence by one half of Europe. At length, Christian Rome, that places its chief glory in the destruction of idolatry, is ranked with the heathens, by the laws of a powerful and discerning people, who are deservedly held in high esteem by the rest of Europe.

The enthusiasm of the English nation did not stop at these demonstrations of horror and aversion to popery; accusations and punishments were still continued.

But the most deplorable circumstance was the execution of lord Stafford, a venerable nobleman, of tried fidelity to his king and country, who had retired from public business, and was closing the career of an honourable life, by the exercise of every domestic virtue. He had the reputation of being a papist, though he was not. He was accused by one of the state-informers, of having hired him to murder the king; and though it was proved that he had never spoken to the person who was his accuser, yet the wretch was believed. The innocence of lord Stafford availed him nought in the day of trial; he was condemned to lose his head; and by the same shameful and wicked weakness, which had cost his father his crown and his life, Charles did not dare to pardon him. This example proves that the tyranny of public bodies is always more heavy than that of a king. There are a thousand ways to pacify the resentment of a sovereign; there are none to bend the inflexible cruelty of the public, when carried away by prejudice. Each member is filled with the fury that animates the whole, imparts it with redoubled force to his companions, and gives himself up without fear to the most pitiless inhumanity, conscious that an individual is not answerable for the actions of a community.

While the papists and the church of England party were exhibiting these bloody spectacles in London, the presbyterians in Scotland presented a scene no less ab-

furd, and still more abominable. They murdered the archbishop of St. Andrew's, primate of that kingdom, where the episcopal government still continued, because this prelate had stood up in defence of his prerogatives. After this noble action, the presbyterians assembled the people, and in their sermons openly compared their shocking deed with those of Jael, Ehud and Judith, recorded in holy writ, and to which indeed it bore a pretty near resemblance. From the church they led their infatuated auditors with the sound of drum to Glasgow, of which they made themselves masters. After this they took an oath that they would no longer acknowledge the king as supreme head of the church, nor his brother as king after his death; and that they would shew obedience to no one but the Lord, to whom they would sacrifice all the bishops who opposed the workings of the saints.

1679 The king was now obliged to send his natural son, the duke of Monmouth, with a small army against these saints. The presbyterians marched to meet him with eight thousand men headed by ministers of the gospel. This army styled itself *the army of the Lord*. An old minister got upon a little hillock; and caused his hands to be supported, as we read of Aaron, in order to insure victory to those of his party; notwithstanding which, the army of the Lord was routed at the very first onset, and twelve hundred of the saints taken prisoners, whom the duke treated with the greatest humanity; he hanged only two of the most active of their ministers, and set at liberty every one who would take an oath, not to make any more disturbances in the country, in God's name. Nine hundred accepted their liberty on these conditions: the remaining three hundred declared that it was better to obey God than man, and that they had rather suffer death themselves, than not be allowed to kill all the church of England men and papists. Upon this they were ordered to be transported to America; and the ship that was carrying them over being cast away, they all received the crown of martyrdom at the bottom of the sea.

This spirit of folly continued sometime longer in England, Scotland and Ireland; but at length the king found means to restore the public tranquillity, not so much by his prudence perhaps, as by the amiableness of his disposition, and that pleasing affability which won him the hearts of all who approached him, and insensibly softened the gloomy ferocity of discontented factions, and harmonized the minds of jarring parties.

Charles II. seems to have been the first king of England who bribed his parliaments, that is, who purchased the votes of members by private pensions: at least, in a country where scarce any thing is kept private, this method had never been made public before; there had been no proof that the kings his predecessors had ever taken this step, which shortens difficulties, and prevents contradictions.

The second parliament, which was summoned in 1679, proceeded against eighteen members of the former house of commons, which had sat eighteen years. They charged them with having received pensions from the crown; but as there was no law forbidding the subject to accept of a gratification from his sovereign, the prosecution dropped.

Charles II. perceiving, however, that the house of commons, who had beheaded his father, wanted to disinherit his brother in his own life-time, and apprehending the consequences of such an attempt, dissolved this 1681 parliament, and summoned no other the remaining part of his reign.

Every thing was quiet, as soon as the clashing ceased betwixt the regal and parliamentary authority. The king was at length reduced to live frugally upon his revenue, and an annual pension of an hundred thousand pounds sterling from Louis XIV. He maintained only a body of four thousand men to defend his person; yet the nation made as great a noise about this handful of troops, as if he had a potent army. His predecessors had seldom above an hundred men for their ordinary guard.

At that time there were only two political parties known in England; the tories who were for absolute submission to kings; and the whigs, who maintained the rights of the people, and limited those of the sovereign. The latter have generally prevailed over the former.

But what has raised England to so high a pitch of power is, that all parties, ever since the reign of queen Elizabeth, have equally concurred to the encouragement of trade. The very parliament that beheaded the king, was busied about commercial laws, as if it had been in the most peaceable times. The blood of Charles I. was still reeking, when this assembly, though almost intirely composed of fanatics, made the famous navigation act, in 1650. This act was attributed to Cromwell, who, on the contrary had been offended with it; because the prejudice it did the Dutch, was one cause of the war between England and the United Provinces; and, as this war diverted the chief expences of the public towards the navy, of course it tended to the reduction of the land forces, of which Cromwell was general. The navigation act, however, has continued in force ever since. The purport of it is, not to suffer any foreign vessel to import merchandizes into England, unless they be of the growth of the country to which that vessel belongs.

So early as the reign of queen Elizabeth there had been an East-India company, even prior to that of the Dutch; and a new one was afterwards erected in the reign of king William. From the year 1597 till 1612, the English were sole possessors of the whale fishery: but the chief source of their wealth was their wool. Formerly they only traded in the sale of it unwrought; but ever since the reign of queen Elizabeth they have manufactured the finest cloth in Europe. Agriculture, after having been long neglected, hath proved as advantageous to this nation, as the mines of Peru to the Spaniards. It hath been chiefly promoted since 1689, when they began to give the bounty, or an encouragement for the exportation of grain. The government
since

since that time hath granted five shillings for every measure of wheat sent abroad, when this measure, which contains four and twenty Paris bushels, is worth no more than eight and forty shillings in London. The sale of all other grain has been encouraged in proportion; and it has been lately proved in parliament, that the exportation of grain in four years, was worth upwards of seven millions sterling.

England had not all these advantages in the reign of Charles II: she was tributary to the industry of the French, who every year drew above eight millions of livres from her upon the balance of trade. She had as yet no manufactures of linen, of glass, copper, brass, steel, paper, nor even of hats. For almost all these articles of industry she is indebted to the revocation of the edict of Nants.

From this single circumstance one may easily judge, whether the flatterers of Louis XIV. had reason to commend him, for depriving France of such a number of useful subjects. In 1687, the English, being sensible of the advantage that would accrue to their nation from such a number of French artisans, who had taken shelter among them, gave them upwards of sixty thousand pounds in charity; and in London only, thirteen thousand of those fugitives were maintained at the public expence for a whole year.

This application to trade, in a warlike nation, has at length enabled her to subsidize one part of Europe against France. She has multiplied her credit in our days, without multiplying her funds, so that the debt of the nation to individuals amounts to upwards of four millions sterling per annum. This is the very situation of the kingdom of France, where the government, under the king's name, is indebted about the same sum to annuitants, and to those who have purchased employments. This operation, unknown to so many other nations, and especially to those of Asia, hath been the melancholy fruit of our wars, and the last effort of political industry; an industry which is as dangerous as war itself.

C H A P. CLXXXIII.

Of Italy, and principally of Rome, at the End of the sixteenth Century.—Of the council of Trent;—the Reformation of the Calendar, &c.

AT the end of the sixteenth, and the beginning of the eighteenth century, the situation of Italy was the very reverse of that of France and Germany. The latter were in a declining state, destitute of commerce, industry, and civil polity, in a word, abandoned to anarchy; whereas the former began to enjoy repose, and to cultivate the polite arts, which in other countries were either unknown, or but rude and imperfect. Naples and Sicily had undergone no revolutions; nor were they even disturbed by insurrections. When pope Paul IV. at the instigation of his nephews, wanted to wrest those kingdoms from Philip II. with the aid of Henry II. king of France; he pretended to transfer them to the duke of Anjou, afterwards Henry III. in consideration of an annual tribute of twenty thousand ducats instead of six thousand; and especially on condition that his nephews should have large and independent principalities in those countries.

Naples was at that time the only tributary kingdom in the universe. It was said that the court of Rome wanted to put an end to that dependency, and to annex this realm to the holy see; which would have been giving such a power to the popes, as must have enabled them to hold the balance of Italy; but it was impossible either for Paul IV. or for all Italy together, to wrest Naples from Philip II. in order to give it to the king of France, and successively to strip the two most powerful princes in Christendom. The enterprize of Paul IV. was rash and unfortunate; the famous duke of Alva, at that time viceroy of Naples, insulted this silly pontiff, by melting down the bells, and all the brass in Benevento, a city belonging to the holy see, in order to convert them into cannon. The war ended

almost



almost as soon as it began. The duke of Alva flattered himself with the hopes of taking Rome, after the example of Charles V. and the Otho's; but in a few months he kissed the pope's toe, the bells were restored to Benevento, and the dispute was ended.

After the death of Paul IV. the condemnation of his two nephews, the prince of Pagliano and cardinal Caraffa, afforded a frightful spectacle. The sacred college was shocked at the execution of this cardinal, who ^{Mar.} 1560 was strangled by order of Pius IV. as cardinal Poli had been treated under Leo X. But a single act does not constitute a cruel reign; besides, the Romans were not oppressed: they complained only of the sale of offices, an abuse which has greatly increased since.

The council of Trent ended very quietly under Pius ¹⁵⁶³ IV.* it was productive of no change, either among the catholics who believed all the articles of faith established by this council, or among the protestants who did not believe them: nor did it make any alteration in the customs of some catholic countries, which adopted rules of discipline different from those of the council.

France, in particular, preserved what she calls the liberties of the Gallican church, which are indeed those of the kingdom. Four and twenty articles, contrary to the rights of the civil magistrate, were never adopted in that country: the chief of these invested bishops alone with the administration of hospitals, gave the power of trying bishops in criminal cases to the pope only, and subjected the laity on many occasions to episcopal jurisdiction. For these reasons France always rejected this council in regard to discipline. The kings of Spain received it throughout their dominions with the highest respect, and yet with the greatest limitations. Venice imitated Spain. The catholics of Germany still demanded the use of the cup, and the marriage of the clergy. Pius IV. granted the communion under both kinds, by particular briefs, to the emperor Maximilian II. and to the archbishop of Mentz; but upon the ar-

* See Chap. clxxii.

ticle of celibacy, he was inflexible. The history of the popes gives as a reason for this, that as Pius IV. had got rid of the council, he had nothing farther to fear; and thence it is, adds the same author, "That this pope, who was violating both human and divine laws, acted the scrupulous part in regard to celibacy." It is extremely false, that Pius IV. was violating both human and divine laws; and it is evident that, by preserving the ancient discipline of sacerdotal celibacy, of such long standing in the western church, he conformed to an opinion that was become part of the canon law.

All the other customs in the discipline of the church of Germany, were suffered to continue. The questions obnoxious to the secular power produced no more bloodshed, as formerly: there were still a few difficulties, a few bones of contention betwixt the court of Rome and the catholic princes, but no mischief followed from any of those little disputes. The *interdict* of Venice, under Paul V. has been the only quarrel of any consequence since that period: the religious wars in Germany and France made the court of Rome very uneasy; and the pope generally kept fair with the catholic princes, lest they should turn protestants. But weak popes were indifferently treated, when they had a potent prince to deal with, like Philip, who was master of the conclave.

A general police was wanting in Italy; this was its great misfortune: it was for a long time infested with banditti, in the midst of the polite arts, and in the center of peace, as had been the case of Greece in barbarous ages. From the frontiers of the Milanese to the further extremity of the kingdom of Naples, gangs of banditti were continually roving from one province to another, and either purchased protections, or extorted tolerations from the petty princes. They were not exterminated in the ecclesiastical state, till the pontificate of Sixtus V. and even after his time they appeared sometimes. This was an encouragement to assassination: the use of the stileto was but too common in the towns, while the banditti infested the country;
the

the scholars of Padua were accustomed to knock people down in the night, as they walked through the piazzas.

Notwithstanding these disorders, Italy was the most flourishing, though not the most powerful country in Europe: there was an end of those foreign wars, by which it had been ravaged after the reign of Charles VIII. king of France; no more talk of those intestine broils betwixt different principalities and cities; in short, no more to be heard of those plots, and conspiracies that had been heretofore so frequent. Naples, Venice, Rome, and Florence, invited foreigners, by their magnificence, and by the culture of the polite arts. The pleasures of the mind were scarce known but in this climate; while religion was exhibited under a most pompous appearance, necessary for a people of such exquisite sensibility. — It was Italy alone, that had raised temples worthy of antiquity; and St. Peter's at Rome surpassed them all. If superstitious practices, false traditions, and forged miracles, still subsisted; they were despised by the wise, who knew full well, that there have been frauds in all ages to amuse the populace.

Perhaps the ultramontane writers, who declaim with such severity against these abuses, have not sufficiently distinguished betwixt the people and their guides. The Roman senate were not to be despised, because the temples of Æsculapius were filled with the offerings of infirm people, whom nature had recovered; because the altars of Neptune were adorned or disfigured by a thousand votive pictures of voyagers, who had escaped with life upon being cast away; or because incense used to burn and smoke of itself on a sacred stone in Egnatia. Several protestants, after enjoying the pleasures of Naples, have written most bitter invectives against the three miracles, which are performed in that city on a particular day, when the blood of St. Januarius, St. John Baptist, and St. Stephen, preserved in vials, begins to liquefy at the approach of the heads of those saints. They accuse the teachers of those churches of attributing idle miracles to the Deity. The learned and ingenious Mr. Addison says, “ It is one of the most bung-

"ling tricks that ever he saw." All those writers might, upon reflexion, have observed, that these institutions are not prejudicial to morals, which should be the principal aim of civil and ecclesiastic polity; that in all probability, the lively imaginations of people in warm climates, have need of visible signs to represent the Deity continually to their senses; in a word, that these signs cannot be abolished, till they become contemptible to the vulgar, by whom they are now revered.

To Pius IV. succeeded the Dominican Gisleri, Pius V. this man was detested even in Rome, for the severity with which he had acted as inquisitor, an office publicly opposed in other places by the secular courts. The famous bull, *in cæna Domini*, devised by Paul III. and published by Pius V. and in which all the rights of sovereigns are attacked, gave offence to several princes, and occasioned the outcry of many universities.

The suppression of the order of the *Humiliati*, was one of the chief events of his pontificate. The religious of that denomination were settled chiefly in the Milanese, and led very scandalous lives. St. Charles Borromeo, archbishop of Milan, wanting to reform the order, four of the members conspired against his life; and one of them fired a pistol at him, while he was saying
 1571 his prayers. The holy man, being only slightly wounded, petitioned the pope to pardon the criminals; but he punished them with death, and suppressed the order. This pontiff sent a body of forces into France, to assist Charles IX. against the Huguenots. These troops were at the battle of Moncontour. To so low an ebb was the French government at that time fallen, that two thousand of the pope's soldiers were looked upon as a very useful succour.

What renders the memory of Pius V. so sacred, was his zeal to defend Christianity against the Turks. His highest encomium comes from Constantinople itself, where they made public rejoicings at his death.

Gregory XIII. of the family of Buoncompagno, and successor of Pius V. gained immortal honour by the reformation of the calendar, which goes by his name; wherein

where
all
shew
Man
mity
or co
first
year
they
reme
a new
pont
they
tians
The
in the
rity f
surpa
As
always
qualit
emplo
dria.
of lea
school
even
that t
stones
or rat
imitat
among
famed
The
manne
their o
genera
regular
lendar
Alexan
fell th

wherein he imitated Julius Cæsar. The necessity which all nations have been under, of reforming the year, shews the slow progress even of the most useful arts. Mankind knew how to ravage the earth from one extremity to the other, before they had a knowledge of time, or could regulate their days. The ancient Romans at first had no more than ten lunar months, so that their year was of three hundred and four days; but afterwards they brought it to three hundred and fifty-five. Every remedy they applied to this false computation, proved a new error. From the time of Numa Pompilius, the pontiffs had been the astronomers of the nation, as they had been also among the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Persians, and almost all the people of Asia. The knowledge of time rendered them more venerable in the eye of the public; for nothing conciliates authority so much as the knowledge of useful subjects, which surpasses the capacity of the vulgar.

As the supreme pontificate among the Romans was always held by a senator; Julius Cæsar, in his pontifical quality, reformed the calendar: for which purpose he employed Sosigenes, a Greek mathematician of Alexandria. Alexander the great had made this city the seat of learning and commerce: it was the most celebrated school for the mathematics; where the Egyptians, and even the Jews, improved in real knowledge. Before that time, the Egyptians knew how to raise huge massive stones; but the Greeks taught them all the polite arts, or rather practised them in that country without being imitated by the natives. And indeed we do not find among this effeminate servile nation, any one person famed for the Grecian arts.

The Christian pontiffs regulated the year, in the same manner as the pontiffs of ancient Rome, because it was their office to proclaim the great solemnities. The first general council held at Nicea in 325, perceiving the irregularity which time had produced in the Julian calendar, consulted, as Cæsar had done, the Greeks of Alexandria, who made answer, that the vernal equinox fell that year on the 21st of March; and the fathers

settled the time for the celebration of Easter according to this principle.

Two trifling mistakes in the Julian calculation, and in that of the astronomers consulted by this council, made a considerable increase in a succession of ages. The first of these is owing to the famous golden number of Meton the Athenian: this allows nineteen years to the revolution, by which the moon comes back to the same point of the heavens; and it wants but an hour and a half: a mistake almost insensible in a single century, but considerable in many. It was the same in regard to the apparent revolution of the sun, and of the points which fix the equinoxes and the solstices. The vernal equinox, at the time of the council of Nice, was upon the 21st of March; but at the time of the council of Trent, the equinox had advanced ten days, and fell upon the eleventh of the month. The cause of this precession of the equinoxes was unknown to all antiquity, and has not been long discovered; it is owing to a particular motion of the earth, which concludes its period in twenty-five thousand nine hundred years, and makes the equinoxes and solstices pass successively through all the points of the zodiac. This motion is the effect of gravitation, the phænomena of which seemed to be above the reach of human capacity, till discovered and explained by Sir Isaac Newton.

However, under Gregory XIII. the business was not concerning this precession of the equinoxes, but to remove the sensible confusion which began to disturb the civil year. Gregory consulted the most celebrated astronomers in Europe. A physician named Lilio, who was a native of Rome, had the honour of furnishing the simplest and easiest manner of restoring the order of the year, as we have it in the new calendar: they had only to strike ten days out of the year 1582, which was the æra of the Gregorian reformation, and to use an easy precaution for preventing the like confusion in future ages. No body knows any thing of this Lilio; for the calendar bears the name of pope Gregory, just as Sostigenes's name was absorbed in that of Cæsar. The an-

cient

cient Greeks did not behave so; the artists were left in possession of the glory of invention.

Gregory XIII. had the honour of concluding this necessary reformation; but he had more trouble in prevailing on other nations to receive it, than in getting it digested by the mathematicians. France opposed it for Nov. some months; till at length, in consequence of an edict 3, of Henry III. registered in the parliament of Paris, they 1582. accustomed themselves to the right computation: but the emperor Maximilian II. could not persuade the diet of Augsburg, that the equinox was advanced ten days. They were afraid lest the court of Rome, by instructing mankind, should assume a right to command. Hence the old calendar continued some time even among the catholics of Germany; but the protestants of every communion obstinately refused to receive a truth delivered by the pope, which they ought to have embraced, even if proposed by the Turk.

The latter end of the pontificate of Gregory XIII. 1575 was rendered famous by the embassy from Japan. Rome was making spiritual conquests at the remotest corner of the earth, while she sustained so many losses in Europe. Three kings or princes of Japan, a country then divided into several sovereignties, sent each of them one of their nearest relations to greet Philip II. king of Spain, as the most potent of all the Christian princes; and the pope as father of all kings. The letters of those princes to the pope begin with paying adoration to his holiness. The first, from the king of Bungo, was directed thus: "To the adorable, who on earth supplies the place of the king of heaven:" it concluded thus; "With fear and respect I address your holiness, whom I adore, and whose most sacred feet I kiss." The other two are couched almost in the same terms. Spain at that time flattered herself that Japan would become one of her provinces; while the Roman pontiff saw one-third of this empire already subject to his ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

The Romans would have been very happy under the administration of Gregory XIII. had not the public tranquillity

tranquillity been interrupted by the banditti. He abolished a few burthenfome taxes, and did not dismember the state in favour of his bastard, as some of his predecessors had done.

C H A P. CLXXXIV.

Of SIXTUS V.

THE reign of Sixtus V. is more celebrated than that of Gregory XIII. or of Pius V. though both these popes did greater things than Sixtus; one having distinguished himself by the battle of Lepanto, of which he was the first mover; and the other by the reformation of the calendar. Sometimes the character of a person, and the extraordinary circumstances of his elevation, shall attract the attention of posterity, more than the memorable actions of others. The disproportion between the birth of Sixtus V. a poor husbandman's son, and his elevation to the supreme dignity, adds to his reputation: yet we have seen that mean parentage was never an obstacle to the pontificate; for at the court of Rome, all preferments are esteemed the reward of merit, though they are also attained by intrigue. Pius V. was hardly of a better family than Sixtus; Adrian VI. was the son of a mechanic; Nicholas V. was born of obscure parents; the father of the famous John XXII. who added a third circle to the tiara, and who wore three crowns without possessing a foot of land, mended shoes at Cahors; and the father of Urban IV. was of the same trade. Adrian IV. one of the greatest popes, was a beggar's son, and had followed the same practice himself. The history of the church abounds with these examples, which are an encouragement to virtue, while they confound human vanity. They who attempt to raise the extraction of Sixtus V. do not reflect, that in this they lessen his personal character; for they strip him of the merit of surmounting

mounting the first difficulties. There is a greater distance from the hog-driver, which he had been in his infancy, to the simple offices he obtained in his order, than from these to the throne of the pontiffs. His life has been compiled at Rome from journals, which inform us of nothing but dates; and from panegyrics, where we learn nothing at all. The Franciscan who wrote the life of Sixtus V. begins with saying, "That he has the honour of treating of the highest, the best, the greatest of pontiffs, princes and sages; *in a word*, of the glorious and immortal Sixtus." Such an exordium only serves to destroy his own credit.

The genius of Sixtus V. is an essential part of his history. What distinguishes him from the other popes, is his acting in quite a different manner from them. To behave with haughtiness, and arrogance, when a simple friar; suddenly to smother the fire of his temper, when he is made cardinal; to appear fifteen years incapable of business, and especially of governing, in order to gain the suffrages of those, who expected to govern in his name; to resume his state and pride the moment he ascends the throne; to be surprizingly severe in his pontificate, and great in all his undertakings; to embellish Rome, and to leave great sums in the pontifical treasury; to disband the troops, and even the guards used by his predecessors, while he disperses the banditti by dint of laws without military force; to make every body respect his dignity, and character; this is what placed his name among the illustrious personages of the age, even when Henry IV. and Elizabeth were yet living. Other sovereigns were in danger of being dethroned, when they ventured upon any arduous enterprize without the assistance of large standing armies, such as have been maintained since that time: it was not so with the pontiffs of Rome, who, uniting the priesthood and the empire, had no need even of guards.

Sixtus V. acquired a very high reputation, by improving the buildings and the police of Rome, as Henry IV. improved those of Paris: but this was the least

least part of the merit of Henry IV. and the greatest of that of Sixtus V. In this respect the pope very much surpassed the king of France: but he reigned over a more peaceable, and at that time more industrious people; and he had the ruins and models of ancient Rome, as likewise the works of his predecessors, to encourage his grand designs.

Under the Roman Cæsars, intire rivers were conveyed to Rome, the space of several miles, by fourteen huge aqueducts supported on arches; this was a constant supply to a hundred and fifty fountains, and to an hundred and eighteen large-public baths; not to mention the water requisite for those artificial seas, on which naval engagements were sometimes exhibited. An hundred thousand statues adorned the public squares, the streets, the temples, the houses. Ninety colossus's were erected on portico's. Forty obelisks of granite from upper Egypt, surprized the spectators, who scarce conceived in what manner those stupendous stones could be transported from the tropic to the banks of the Tiber. All that the popes had to do, was to repair a few aqueducts, to raise a few obelisks from under the ruins, and to dig up some statues.

Sixtus V. restored the Aqua-Martia, whose spring rises twenty-miles from Rome, near the ancient Præneste: he had it conveyed by an aqueduct of thirteen thousand paces in length; and they were obliged to raise arches along the road for the distance of seven miles. Such a work would have been a trifling affair to the Roman empire; but it was a mighty matter to Rome impoverished and reduced.

Five obelisks were raised by his care. The name of the architect Fontana, who restored them, is still famous in Rome; while that of the artists who carved, and transported them to such a distance, is forgot. We read in several travellers, and in an hundred authors who have copied after them, that in erecting the obelisk of the Vatican, the cords happened to be too short, and notwithstanding the prohibition, upon pain of death, that nobody should speak during the operation, a common fellow cried out from among the crowd,

crowd, "Wet the cords." Such tales as these render history ridiculous, being the fruit of ignorance; the captans they made use of, could not want this foolish assistance.

What gave modern Rome some superiority over the ancient, was the cupola of St. Peter's. There were only three antique monuments of this kind extant in the world; part of the dome of the temple of Minerva at Athens, the dome of the Pantheon at Rome, and that of the great Mosque of Constantinople, heretofore the church of St. Sophia, built by Justinian. But these cupolas, though sufficiently raised within, were too flat without. Brunelleschi, the restorer of architecture in Italy in the fourteenth century, remedied this defect in the cathedral of Florence, by building two cupolas, one within the other; but they had something of the Gothic taste, and were not in just proportion. Michael Angelo Buonarota, an artist equally celebrated for painting, sculpture and architecture, gave the designs of the two domes of St. Peter under the pontificate of Julius II. and Sixtus V. erected this work, which surpasseth every thing of the kind, in the space of twenty-two months.

The library, begun by Nicholas V. was so greatly increased about this time, that Sixtus V. may be considered as its real founder. The immense repository in which the books are lodged, is a noble structure. At that time there was no library in Europe so large, nor so curious: but Paris has since outdone Rome; and though the architecture of the king's library may not be comparable to that of the Vatican, yet there is a much greater number of books, disposed in better order, and lent with more ease to private people.

It was a misfortune to Sixtus V. and to his dominions, that all his great foundations impoverished the people, whereas Henry IV. relieved their wants. Both, at their death, left very near the same sum in ready money; for though Henry had a reserve of forty millions of livres at his command, yet there were not above twenty millions in the vaults of the Bastille; and

the five millions of crowns which Sixtus V. laid up in the castle of St. Angelo, were very near equivalent to twenty millions of livres, according to the currency of that time. This money could not be taken out of the circulation, in such a country as Rome, that had scarce either trade or manufactures, without impoverishing the inhabitants. In order to hoard this treasure, and to supply these expences, Sixtus was obliged to give a greater scope to the sale of public offices, than had been granted by his predecessors. Sixtus IV. Julius II. and Leo X. had led the way; but Sixtus V. greatly increased the burden: he created annuities at eight, nine and ten per cent. for the payment of which there was an additional load of taxes. The people forgot he was embellishing Rome, and only felt that he was impoverishing them; so that this pontiff was more hated than admired.

We should always consider the pope in a double capacity, as the sovereign of a temporal state, and as head of the church. Sixtus V. as supreme pontiff, wanted to renew the times of Gregory VII. He declared Henry IV. then only king of Navarre, incapable of succeeding to the crown of France. He issued out a bull, depriving queen Elizabeth of her dominions; and if Philip's invincible armada had succeeded on the coast of England, the bull might have been put in execution. The manner in which he behaved towards Henry III. after the assassination of the duke of Guise, and of the cardinal his brother, was less violent. He contented himself with declaring the king excommunicated, unless he did penance for both those murders. This was imitating St. Ambrose; and acting like Alexander III. who insisted upon a public penance for the murder of Becket, afterwards canonized by the name of St. Thomas of Canterbury. It was very certain that Henry III. had caused two princes to be assassinated in his own house, who indeed were dangerous persons, but had not been legally tried and convicted: and it would have been a difficult matter to convict them, for though they were the chiefs of a pernicious league, yet the

the king himself had signed it. Every circumstance of this double assassination was horrible; and, without entering into the justifications founded on policy and the misfortunes of the times, the common security of mankind seemed to demand a barrier against the like outrages. Sixtus V. lost the fruit of his austere and inflexible behaviour, by maintaining only the rights of the tiara and of the sacred college, not those of humanity; by not condemning the murder of the duke of Guise as much as that of the cardinal; by insisting only on the pretended immunity of the church, and the right claimed by the popes of judging cardinals; by commanding the king of France to set the cardinal of Bourbon and the archbishop of Lyons at liberty, though he had the strongest reasons of state for keeping them confined; in short, by enjoining him to repair to Rome within the space of sixty days, in order to expiate his crime. It is very true that Sixtus V. as the head of the Christian church, might say to a prince of that religion; "Humble yourself in the sight of God for the two murders you have committed:" but he had no right to say to him; "I only am the judge of your clergy, and am intitled to pronounce sentence on you in my court."

This pope seemed to behave less consistently with the dignity and impartial administration of his office, after the parricide committed by James Clement the monk, when he pronounced the following words before the cardinals, faithfully related by the secretary of the consistory: "This murder, said he, which causes so much surprize and admiration, will hardly be believed by posterity. A powerful monarch surrounded by a strong army, which reduced the people of Paris to implore his mercy, is killed with a knife by a poor friar. Surely this great example was given, to the end that all the world may be convinced of the efficacy of God's judgments." This speech of the pope's appeared most shocking, because he seemed to look upon the flagitious act of a villain as the work of divine inspiration.

Sixtus had a right to refuse the empty honours of a funeral service to Henry III. whom he looked upon as excluded from the participation of the prayers of the faithful. For which reason he said, in the same consistory, "I owe these obsequies to the king of France, " but I do not owe them to Henry of Valois, who died " impenitent."

Every thing gives way to interest: this same pope, who had so boldly pretended to deprive Elizabeth and the king of Navarre of their kingdoms; who had summoned king Henry III. to appear at Rome in sixty days, upon pain of excommunication, refused nevertheless to side with the league and with Spain against Henry IV. at that time a heretic. He foresaw that if Philip II. succeeded, so as to be master of France, of the Milanese, and of Naples, he would soon have the holy see and all Italy in his power. Sixtus V. acted therefore, on this occasion, as every prudent man would have acted in his place; he chose rather to run the risk of incurring the indignation of Philip II. than to ruin himself by lending a hand to destroy Henry IV. He died in this anxiety, not daring to succour Henry IV. and afraid of Philip II. The Romans, who groaned under the heavy load of taxes, and who hated so severe and oppressive a government, shewed their resentment Aug. upon the death of Sixtus: with great difficulty were 26, they hindered from disturbing his funeral rites, and 1590 from tearing to pieces the man to whom they had lately paid adoration on their knees. His treasures were all squandered away within a year after his decease, just like those of Henry IV. the usual fate of such hoards, and which sufficiently demonstrates the vanity of human designs.

C H A P. CLXXXV.

Of the Successors of Sixtus V.

WE have here an instance of the great influence which the prejudices of education and country have over mankind. Gregory XIV, a native of Milan, and subject of the king of Spain, was governed by the Spanish faction; which Sixtus V. born a subject of Rome, had the courage to withstand. Gregory sacrificed every thing to Philip II; he raised an army of Italians, to ravage France, with that very treasure which Sixtus V. had amassed for the defence of Italy; and when this army was beaten and dispersed, Gregory XIV. was obliged to set down with the shame of having impoverished himself for the sake of Philip II. and of being domineered by that prince.

Clement VIII. of the family of Aldobrandini, and a native of Florence, conducted himself with more art and address; he well knew, that it was the interest of the holy see to hold the balance as much as possible betwixt France and the house of Austria. This pope added the duchy of Ferrara to the ecclesiastical state. This revolution was owing to the intricacy of the feudal laws, and to the weakness of the empire. The countess Matilda, of whom we have so often made mention, had given Ferrara, Modena, and Reggio, with a great many other lands, to the popes. The emperors had constantly protested against the donation of those demesnes, as fiefs of the crown of Lombardy. However, in spite of the emperor, they became fiefs of the holy see; like Naples, which was held of the pope, after having been a fief of the empire. It was not till lately that Modena and Reggio were solemnly declared Imperial fiefs. But after the pontificate of Gregory VII. they were dependent on Rome, the same as Ferrara; and the house of Modena, heretofore proprietors of those lands, held them only as vicars of the holy see. In vain did the court of Vienna and the Imperial diets con-
stantly

stantly pretend to the supreme jurisdiction over this
 1597 country. Clement. VIII. wrested Ferrara from the
 house of Este; and what at other times might have pro-
 duced a bloody war, was followed only by protests.
 Ever since that time Ferrara has been almost a desert.

This pope performed the ceremony of giving absolu-
 tion to Henry IV. who was represented on this occasion
 by the cardinals du Perron and d'Offat: but we see
 plainly how much the court of Rome was still afraid of
 Philip II. by the caution pope Clement VIII. observed
 in reconciling Henry IV. to the church. This prince
 1595 had solemnly abjured the reformed religion; and yet
 two thirds of the cardinals in consistory still persisted in
 denying him absolution. The French ambassadors had
 much ado to prevent the pope from making use of this
 formula, "We reinstate Henry IV. in his kingdom."
 The court of Rome was indeed willing to acknowledge
 Henry IV. as king of France, and to set this prince in
 opposition to the house of Austria; but at the same
 time the pope maintained his old pretension to dispose
 of kingdoms.

Under Paul V. of the house of Borgheze, was re-
 newed the antient dispute between the secular and eccle-
 siastical jurisdiction, a dispute which had heretofore been
 the cause of so much bloodshed. The senate of Venice
 had prohibited any new donations to the church with-
 1605 out their consent, and especially the alienation of lands
 in favour of religious houses. They thought likewise
 that they had a right to imprison and condemn a canon
 of Vicenza, and an abbot of Nervesè, convicted of rob-
 bery and murder.

The pope wrote to the republic that the imprison-
 ment and condemnation of those two ecclesiastics was
 injurious to the honour of God; he insisted that the
 decrees of the senate should be referred to this nuncio,
 that the two delinquents should be delivered up to him,
 and tried only by the court of Rome.

Paul V. who a little before this had made the re-
 public of Genoa submit upon a similar occasion, ima-
 gined that the Venetians would do so likewise. The
 senate

senate sent an ambassador extraordinary to maintain their rights. The pope made answer to the ambassador, that neither the rights nor arguments of the republic were good for ought, and that he must be obeyed. The senate would not obey. Upon which the doge and the April senators were excommunicated, and the whole state of 17, Venice put under an *interdict*; that is, the clergy were ¹⁶⁰⁶ forbid, upon pain of eternal damnation, to say mass, to perform divine service, to administer the sacraments, or to lend their assistance to the burial of the dead. Thus it was that Gregory VII. and his successors, had behaved formerly to several emperors, knowing that the people would rather chuse to desert their sovereign than their churches; and depending on the readiness of princes to seize the dominions of the person excommunicated. But the times were changed: by this violent proceeding, the pope only exposed his authority, and the senate might have been tempted to shut up all their churches, and even to renounce the catholic religion. They might easily have embraced the Greek, or Lutheran, or the Calvinistical communion; and indeed there was a talk at that time of their separating from the church of Rome. But the change could not have been effected without some trouble; and the king of Spain would have taken advantage of it. The senate therefore only prohibited the publication of the papal monitory throughout their dominions. The grand vicar of the bishop of Padua, to whom this prohibition was signified, made answer to the podesta or magistrate, that he would act as God should inspire him; but, upon the podesta's replying that God had inspired the council of Ten to cause every man to be hanged that disobeyed the senate, the interdict was suppressed; and the court of Rome was so fortunate, as to see the Venetians continue in the catholic communion in spite of his holiness.

There were only a few religious orders that obeyed the pope. The Jesuits did not chuse to be the first that set the example. Their deputies repaired to the general assembly of the Capuchins, and told them, that "in this great affair the whole world had their eye on the
" Capuchins,

“ Capuchins, and that they waited to see what step those fathers would take; which should regulate the conduct of the society.” The Capuchins did not hesitate at shutting up their churches: upon which the Jesuits and the Theatins did the same by theirs. The senate shipped them all off for Rome; and banished the Jesuits for ever.

Amongst so great a number of monks, who since their first establishment had betrayed their country to the interests of the popes, there was one found at Venice, who was a citizen of that place, and who acquired a lasting glory, by defending the cause of his sovereigns against the pretensions of the see of Rome; this was the famous Sarpi, who is so well known by the name of Fra. Paolo. He was theologian to the republic; but this title of theologian did not hinder him from being an excellent civilian. He maintained the cause of the Venetians with all the power of reason, and with a degree of moderation and dexterity which rendered this reason victorious. Two of the pope’s subjects and a Venetian priest bribed two assassins to murder Fra. Paolo. They stabbed him in three places with a stileto, and then made their escape in a ten oared boat that was in readiness for them. An assassination so well concerted, together with the flight of the murderers, effected with so much precaution and expence, made it evident that some persons in power were in the secret. It was laid to the charge of the Jesuits, and even the pope was suspected to have been privy to it: the crime however was disavowed both by the court of Rome and by the Jesuits. Fra. Paolo, who recovered of his wounds, preserved one of the stileto’s with which he had been stabbed, and placed this inscription over it: *stilo della chiesa Romana.*

The king of Spain was inciting the pope against the Venetians; but Henry IV. declared himself their friend. The Venetians began to arm at Verona, Padua, Bergamo, and Brescia; and they raised four thousand men in France. The pope, on the other hand, ordered a levy of four thousand Corsicans, and of a few Swiss catholics.

catholics. This little army was to be commanded by cardinal Borghese. The Turks gave solemn thanks to God for the quarrel betwixt the pope and the Venetians; Henry IV. had the glory, as I have elsewhere observed, of being arbiter of this difference; and of excluding Philip III. from the mediation. Paul V. had even the mortification to find that the accommodation could not be concluded at Rome. The cardinal de Joyeuse, the king's envoy to the republic of Venice, repealed the 1607 excommunication, and the interdict in the pope's name. The pope abandoned by Spain, behaved thenceforward with moderation. The order of Jesuits remained in exile for above fifty years; they were not recalled till the year 1657, at the intreaty of pope Alexander VII. but they were never able to recover their former credit.

Paul V. from that time, carefully avoided making any decision that might expose his authority. In vain was he solicited to determine the immaculate conception of the blessed virgin as an article of faith: he contented himself with forbidding any body to teach the contrary in public; that he might not offend the Dominicans, who pretend she was conceived, like the rest of mankind, in original sin. The Dominicans at that time had great weight in Spain and Italy.

He applied himself to the embellishment of Rome; and collected the choicest pieces of sculpture and painting. Rome is indebted to him for her noblest fountains, especially that which spouts out the water from an antique vase, taken from the baths of Vespasian; and that called *l'Acqua Paola*, an ancient work of Augustus, but restored by this pope: he conveyed the water to the city by an aqueduct of thirty-five thousand paces in length, in imitation of Sixtus V. The popes now began to vie who should leave the noblest monuments behind them. Paul finished the palace of Monte Cavallo. The Borghese palace erected by this pontiff, is one of the principal structures in Rome. Each succeeding pope strove to render this the most magnificent city in the world. Urban VIII. built that great altar of St. Peter's, the columns and ornaments of which

would any where else appear of an enormous size; but here they have only a just proportion: this is the masterpiece of the Florentine, Bernini, an artist worthy of placing his performances with those of his countryman Michael Angelo.

This Urban VIII. was of the family of Barberini, and a lover of the polite arts; he cultivated the Latin Muses himself with success. Thus the Romans in profound peace enjoyed those sweets which letters diffuse through society, and the glory that follows ingenious men. Urban reunited the duchies of Urbino, Pesaro, and Sinigaglia, to the ecclesiastic state, upon the extinction of the house of Rovere, which held those principalities as fiefs of the holy see. The Roman pontiffs had been thus increasing their temporal dominion ever since Alexander VI. The public tranquillity was no longer disturbed; scarce was there any notice taken of the quarrel betwixt Urban VIII. or rather his two nephews, and Edward, duke of Parma, for the money which that prince owed the apostolic chamber upon the duchy of Castro. It was a quarrel of short duration, and attended with little bloodshed, such as one might expect from those modern Romans, whose manners are agreeable to the genius of their government. Cardinal Barberini, the author of this dispute, marched at the head of his little army, reinforced with indulgences. In the greatest battle that was fought upon this occasion, there were only four or five hundred men of a side. The fortress of Piagaia surrendered at discretion, as soon as she saw the artillery, which consisted only of two culverins. And yet, to terminate this dispute, which scarce deserves a place in history, they had recourse to more negotiations, than if the contest had been betwixt Carthage and ancient Rome. I have taken notice of this insignificant event, merely to shew the genius of modern Rome, who determines every thing by negotiation; whereas the old Romans decided their disputes by the sword.

The ceremonies of religion, and precedence, the polite arts, antiquities, buildings, gardens, music, and public

public assemblies, were the amusements of the Romans; while the war of thirty years was laying Germany waste, while the king and people were destroying one another in England, and while France was involved again in a civil war under the minority of Louis XIV.

But, though Rome enjoyed tranquillity, and was celebrated for its public monuments, the people in the main were miserable. The money, expended in the erecting of such a number of magnificent edifices, was carried to other nations in the balance of trade.

The popes were obliged to purchase corn abroad, for there grows but very little in the ecclesiastical state; and afterwards they retailed it in the capital. This custom still continues: there are countries enriched, and others that are impoverished, by luxury. The splendor of a few cardinals, and relations of popes, served only as a contrast to the indigence of the people, who, at the sight of so many fine buildings, seemed however even in the midst of their poverty, to be proud of being citizens of Rome.

Travellers, who went to admire this great city, used to be surprized that from Orvieto to Terracina, for the space of above an hundred miles, there was nothing to be seen but a dreary waste, unfrequented by man or beast. The campagna of Rome is an uninhabitable country, the air being infected by the marshes and stagnated waters, which the ancient Romans used to drain. Besides, Rome stands in an ungrateful soil, on the banks of a river that is scarcely navigable. Its situation on seven hills, seemed as if it was rather designed for a den of wild beasts, than for a city. Its first wars were the excursions of a people who lived upon plunder: and when Camillus the dictator had taken Veii, a town in Umbria, within a few miles of Rome; the Romans wanted to quit their barren territory, and their seven hills, in order to remove to the country of the Veientes. The neighbourhood of Rome was rendered fruitful afterwards, by the money of conquered nations, and by the labour of a vast multitude of slaves. But this spot was rather covered with palaces than with corn.

At length it has reverted to its original state of a desert.

Yet the holy see was possessed of some fruitful lands, for instance, the territory of Bologna. Bishop Burnet, attributes the misery of the people in the most fertile part of this country, to their taxes and the form of government. He pretends, with the generality of writers, that as the reign of an elective prince lasts but a few years, he has neither the power nor the inclination to make such establishments, as prove advantageous to a country. It is far easier to raise obelisks, or to build palaces and temples, than to render a nation industrious and opulent. Though Rome was the capital of the catholic world, it was less populous than Venice or Naples, and far inferior to Paris or London: it was nothing to compare to Amsterdam for riches, nor for the necessary arts, the real source of wealth. Towards the end of the seventeenth century, they reckoned only about an hundred and twenty thousand souls in Rome, by the printed list of families; and this calculation was confirmed by the registers of baptism. There were born, one year with another, three thousand six hundred children; this number of births, multiplied by thirty-four, gives nearly the sum of inhabitants; which is about an hundred and twenty-two thousand four hundred. Paul Jovius, in his History of Leo X. informs us, that in the reign of Clement VII. there were only thirty two thousand inhabitants in Rome. What a difference between these times and those of the Trajans and Antoninuses! There were about eight thousand Jews in Rome, who were not included in this list. These people have always lived quietly there as well as at Leghorn. The Italians never exercised such cruelties against them, as those they were obliged to undergo in Spain and Portugal. There was at that time no country in Europe, where religion inspired the inhabitants with so much lenity as in Italy.

Rome was the center of the liberal arts and of politeness, till the age of Louis XIV. which determined queen Christina to fix her residence in that city. But

Italy

Italy was soon rivalled in many branches, and surpassed in some by France: England was also as much her superior in science, as in commerce. Rome, however, preserved the glory of its antiquities, and the works of ingenious artists, by which it has been distinguished ever since the time of Julius II.

C H A P. CLXXXVI.

Continuation of the State of Italy in the seventeenth Century.

OF TUSCANY.

TUSCANY, like the ecclesiastical state, ever since the sixteenth century, was a peaceful happy country. Florence, the rival of Rome, invited a multitude of strangers, to come and admire the ancient and modern master-pieces with which it was filled. It had no less than an hundred and sixty public statues. The only two which decorated Paris, that of Henry IV. and the horse which bears the statue of Louis XIII. had been cast at Florence, and were presents from the great dukes.

Commerce had raised Tuscany to so flourishing a condition, and so greatly enriched its sovereigns, that the grand duke Cosmo II. was able to send twenty thousand men to the assistance of the duke of Mantua, against the duke of Savoy in 1613, without laying any new duty upon his subjects: which is very extraordinary even among the most powerful nations.

OF VENICE.

THE city of Venice enjoyed a still greater advantage, namely, that ever since the fourteenth century its internal tranquillity was never disturbed one single moment; there had been no tumult, no sedition, no dangerous commotion. As travellers flocked to Rome and Florence

Florence to admire the superb monuments of the polite arts; so they were impatient to visit Venice for the sake of liberty and pleasure; besides, it had excellent paintings as well as Rome. The liberal arts were cultivated by the republic; and strangers were attracted by magnificent spectacles. Rome was the seat of ceremony, and Venice of diversion. The republic had concluded a peace with the Turks after the battle of Lepanto; and though her trade to the Levant had been upon the decline, it was still considerable; she was possessed of Candia, and several islands, of Istria, Dalmatia, part of Albania, and of whatever she still preserves in Italy.

1618 In the midst of her prosperities she was upon the brink of being destroyed by a conspiracy, of which there had been no similar instance since the foundation of the republic. The abbé de St. Real, who has written this memorable event in the Sallustian style, has embellished it with fiction; but the substance of the story is true. Venice had been engaged in a petty war with the house of Austria on the coast of Istria. The king of Spain, Philip III. lord of the Milanese, was always a secret enemy of the Venetians. The duke d'Osuna, viceroy of Naples, don Pedro of Toledo, governor of Milan, and the marquis de Bedmar, the Spanish ambassador at Venice, afterwards cardinal de la Cueva, all three joined to destroy the republic. Their measures were so well concerted, and the project was of so extraordinary a nature, that the senate, notwithstanding all their sagacity and vigilance, did not entertain the least suspicion of it. Venice is guarded by its situation in the lagunes: the mud of those lagunes, being impelled to and fro by the waters of rivers that disgorge into them, the channel for shipping is never constant, but changes almost every day. The republic had a formidable fleet on the coast of Istria, where she was at war with Ferdinand, archduke of Austria, afterwards Ferdinand II. It seemed impossible for an enemy to get into Venice. Yet the marquis de Bedmar assembled about five hundred strangers; whom the ring-leaders engaged under different pretexts, and made
sure

sure of with the ambassador's money. The town was to be set on fire in several parts at once: a body of troops was to march from the Milanese over the *terra firma*: sailors were bribed to pilot a number of boats filled with soldiers, which the duke d'Offuna had got ready within a few leagues of Venice: one of the conspirators, named Pierre, who was a sea-officer in the service of the republic, and had the command of twelve of her ships, undertook to set them on fire, which would prevent the rest of the fleet from coming time enough to the relief of the city. The conspirators were all foreigners, of different nations; so that it is not at all surprizing the plot was discovered. The procurator Nani, a celebrated historian of this republic, says, that the senate were informed of the whole conspiracy by several: but he makes no mention of the pretended remorse felt by Jaffier, one of the conspirators, when Renaudot, their leader, haranguing them the last time, is said to have drawn so lively a picture of the horrid enterprize, that Jaffier, instead of being incited, began to relent. These harangues flowed from the imagination of the writers; we ought ever to mistrust them in reading history. It is neither in the nature of things, nor at all probable, that a ringleader should make a pathetic description to the conspirators, of the cruelties they are about to commit, or frighten the imagination, of those whom he ought rather to incite. All the conspirators whom the senate could find, were drowned immediately in the canals of Venice. As to Bedmar, the republic shewed a respect to his public character, which she needed not to have done; the senate gave directions for his being privately conducted out of the city, to save him from the fury of the populace.

After Venice had escaped this danger, she continued in a flourishing state till taking of Candia. This republic maintained the war singly against the Turkish emperor the space of thirty years, from 1641 to 1669. The siege of Candia, the longest and most memorable in history, lasted near twenty years; sometimes turned into a blockade, at other times carried on but faintly, then

then left off, resumed again at different intervals, and at length continued two years and a half without interruption, till this heap of ashes surrendered to the Turks, together with almost the whole island, in 1669.

With how much slowness and difficulty, human nature is civilized and society improved! in the neighbourhood of Venice, on the very borders of Italy, where all the arts so greatly flourished, there were people, in every respect as unpolished, as the northern nations in those days. The inhabitants of Istria, Croatia, Dalmatia, were almost barbarians: and yet this was the Dalmatia, so fruitful and agreeable at the time of the Roman empire: this was the delicious spot that Dioclesian chose for his retreat, when neither the city, nor the name of Venice existed. Such is the vicissitude of human affairs! the Morlacks especially were reckoned the most savage people upon the face of the earth. Thus it is that neither Sardinia, nor Corsica partook of the moral and intellectual improvements, which at that time adorned the rest of the Italians. It was with Italy as with ancient Greece, the borders of which were inhabited by barbarous nations.

Of M A L T A.

THE knights of Malta maintained themselves in this island, which was given them by Charles V. after Solyman had driven them out of Rhodes, in 1523. At first the grand master Villiers l'Isle Adam, with his knights and the Rhodians that adhered to the order, were in an itinerant state, rambling from town to town, to Messina, to Gallipoli, to Rome, to Viterbo. This same grand master went as far as Madrid, to implore the assistance of Charles V; thence he proceeded to France, and to England, endeavouring to save his order from ruin. Charles V. made the knights a present of Malta and Tripoli, in 1525; but Solyman's admirals soon dispossessed them of Tripoli. Malta was almost a barren rock: by great labour the soil had been rendered fruitful in former ages, when this island was in the hands

hands of the Carthaginians; for the new proprietors found the ruins of antique columns, and of huge marble structures, with inscriptions in the Punic language. These remains of grandeur were a proof that the country had been heretofore in a flourishing state. The Romans thought it worth their while to wrest it from the Carthaginians; the Arabians made themselves masters of it in the ninth century: and Roger the Norman, count of Sicily, annexed it to Sicily, towards the end of the twelfth century. When Villiers L'isle Adam removed the seat of his order to Malta, the same Solymán enraged at the numerous captures of Turkish vessels by an enemy, whom he thought he had destroyed, determined to dispossess them of this island, in the same manner as he had deprived them of Rhodes. He sent an army of thirty thousand men before this small place, ¹⁵⁶⁵ which was defended only by seven hundred knights. The grand master John de la Vallette, at that time seventy one years of age, held out a siege of four months.

The Turks attempted to storm it several times in different places: they were repulsed with machines of a new invention; these were great round pieces of wood, covered with wool, and the wool daubed over with brandy, oil, salt-petre, and gunpowder; a number of these were set on fire, and thrown among the assailants. At length a reinforcement of six thousand men having landed from Sicily, the Turks raised the siege. The principal town of Malta, which had sustained the greatest number of assaults, was called the *victorious*, a title it still preserves. The grand master de la Vallette built a new city, which bears his name, and has rendered Malta impregnable. This little island has ever since set the whole Ottoman power at defiance; but the order has never been rich enough to attempt any great conquests, or to fit out numerous fleets. This community of warriors subsists intirely by the benefices they possess in catholic countries; but they have done less harm by far to the Turks, than the Algerine Corsairs have done to the Christians.

Of Holland in the Seventeenth Century.

HOLLAND is the more deserving of our attention, as it is a state of quite a new kind, which is become powerful without possessing hardly a foot of land; rich, without being able of itself to maintain the twentieth part of its inhabitants; and considerable in 1609 Europe by its exploits at the remotest extremity of Asia. We have seen this republic acknowledged a free and independent state by the king of Spain her former master, after having obtained her liberty by a war of forty years. Industry and sobriety were the first guardians of this liberty. It is related, that as the marquis of Spinola, and the president Richardot, were upon their way to the Hague in 1608, in order to negotiate the first truce with the Dutch, they saw eight or nine persons stepping out of a little boat, and seating themselves upon the grass, where they made a frugal repast upon bread and cheese, and beer; each carrying his own provisions. The Spanish ambassadors asked a peasant, who those travellers were? the peasant answered; "They are the deputies of the states, our sovereign lords and masters." Upon which the ambassadors cried out; "These people we shall never be able to conquer; we must even make peace with them." This is like what happened formerly to the ambassadors of Sparta, and those of the king of Persia. The same cause might have produced the same effect. In general the private people in those provinces were poor at that time, and the state was rich; whereas individuals are now grown rich, while the state is indigent. The reason of this is, the first fruits of commerce had been consecrated to the public security.

The Dutch were neither possessed at that time of the Cape of Good Hope, where they made no settlements till the year 1653; nor of Cochin and its dependencies; nor of Molucca. They did not trade as yet directly to China.

China. They were excluded from the commerce of Japan, till the year 1609, by the Portuguese, or rather by the Spaniards, who were still masters of Portugal. But they had already subdued the Moluccas, and began to make settlements in Java. From the year 1602 to 1609, the East-India Company had more than doubled their capital. Ambassadors from Siam in 1608, had already paid the same honours to this trading nation, as they afterwards did to Louis XIV. Japanese ambassadors came likewise in 1609, to conclude a treaty at the Hague. The emperor of Fez and Morocco applied to them for succours of men and ships. Their fortune and their glory had been increasing above forty years by commerce and war.

* [The lenity of this government, and the toleration extended to all sorts of religions, dangerous perhaps in other countries, but necessary in this, peopled Holland with a multitude of foreigners, especially Walloons, whom the inquisition persecuted in their own country, and who from slaves became citizens.

The Calvinistical persuasion, then predominant in Holland, contributed also to aggrandize the republic. This country was too poor at that time to support the magnificence of prelates or the multitude of religious orders; and a soil that required hands, could not admit of people who engage by oath, as much as in them lies, to let the human species perish. They had the example of England before their eyes, which was grown one third more populous, since the ministers of the altar enjoyed the comforts of matrimony, and the hopes of families were no longer buried in the celibacy of a cloyster.

Amsterdam, notwithstanding the inconveniencies of its port, was become the magazine of the universe. Every part of Holland was enriched and improved by immense labour. The waters of the ocean were shut out by double dykes. Canals were scooped in all the

* This whole passage, to these words, *one view*, is taken from the Introduction to the Age of Louis XIV, and resto ed here to its proper place. V.

towns, and lined with free-stone; the streets were turned into large quays, adorned with lofty trees. Barges laden with goods came up to the merchant's doors; while strangers were never tired with admiring that singular mixture formed by the ridges of houses, the tops of trees, and the streamers flying, which exhibit the appearance of town and country, and of a fleet, all under one view.]

But human affairs are so checquered with good and evil; and mankind are so apt to deviate from their principles, that this republic had like to have destroyed the liberty for which she had so bravely fought; and perfection was seen to riot in the blood of a people, whose
 1609 happiness and laws were founded on toleration. Two Calvinistical doctors did what so many doctors have done in other places. Gomar and Arminius disputed most furiously at Leyden about what neither of them understood. This produced dissensions in the United Provinces. The dispute was in many respects similar to those of the Thomists and Scotists, or of the Jansenists and Molinists, concerning predestination, grace, liberty, and other obscure and frivolous articles, where they know not how to define the very subject about which they dispute. The leisure they enjoyed during the truce, unluckily gave those ignorant people an opportunity to fill their heads with theological disputes; till at length, out of a scholastic controversy, there arose two parties in the state. Maurice, prince of Orange, was at the head of the Gomarists: the pensionary Barnevelt favoured the Arminians. Du Maurier says, that he had been told by the ambassador his father, that Maurice having proposed to the pensionary Barnevelt to consent to his assuming the supreme power, this zealous republican shewed him the danger and injustice of the proposal; and from that time Barnevelt's ruin was resolved upon. This however is certain, that the stadtholder endeavoured to increase his authority by means of the Gomarists, and Barnevelt to check it by the help of the Arminians: that several towns levied soldiers who were called *Expectants*, because they *expected* their orders from the magistrate, but would take none from the stadtholder:

stadtholder: that there were insurrections in several cities; and that prince Maurice vigorously persecuted the party that opposed him. At length he convened a Calvinistical council at Dordrecht, composed of all the reformed churches in Europe, except that of France, whom the king would not suffer to send her deputies. The fathers of this synod, who had exclaimed so loudly against the fathers of various councils, and against their authority, condemned the Arminians, just as they themselves had been condemned by the council of Trent. Above a hundred Arminian ministers were banished out of the United Provinces. Prince Maurice chose six and twenty commissioners from among the body of the nobility and the magistrates, to try the grand pensionary Barneveldt, the celebrated Grotius, and some others of the Arminian party. They had been kept six months in confinement, before they were brought to their trial.

One of the chief motives of the revolt of the seven provinces and of the princes of Orange against Spain, was the duke of Alva's severity, in suffering prisoners to languish a great while in confinement, without bringing them to a trial, and in appointing commissioners to condemn them. The same grievances which had caused such complaints under the Spanish monarchy, were revived again in the bosom of liberty. Barneveldt was beheaded at the Hague, more unjustly than count Egmont, and count Horn at Brussels. He was an old man of seventy, who had served the republic forty years in the cabinet, with as much success as Maurice and his brothers had served her in the field. The sentence imported, "that he had done all he could do to vex the church of God." Grotius, afterwards ambassador from Sweden to France, and more illustrious for his writings than for his embassy, was condemned to perpetual imprisonment, from whence he escaped by the fortunate temerity of his wife. This violence of the stadtholder produced conspiracies, which were followed by more executions. One of Barneveldt's sons resolved to revenge his father's blood upon prince Maurice. The plot was discovered. His accomplices, at the head of whom was an Arminian minister, perished by the hands

1623 hands of the executioner. This son of Barnevelt had the good fortune to escape, while the rest of the conspirators were seized: but his younger brother was beheaded, metely for being privy to the conspiracy. De Thou was executed in France for the same reason. The condemnation of the young Dutchman was infinitely more cruel: it was the highest pitch of injustice to put him to death, because he would not turn informer against his brother. Had these melancholy times continued, the Dutch, with all their liberty, would have been more wretched than their ancestors, when slaves to the duke of Alva.

Amsterdam, though full of Gomarists, still favoured the Arminians, and embraced the principle of toleration. The ambition and cruelty of prince Maurice made a deep impresson on the minds of the Dutch; and the remembrance of Barnevelt's death contributed not a little to exclude the young prince of Orange, William III. afterwards king of England, from the stadtholdership. He was yet in his cradle, when the pensionary de Wit stipulated, in the treaty of peace between the states-general and Cromwell in 1653, that there should be no more stadtholders in Holland. Cromwell persecuted the memory of king Charles I. in his grandson; while the pensionary de Wit was revenging the death of another pensionary. This conduct proved at length the fatal cause of the death of himself and his brother: but these were almost the only catastrophes in Holland, produced by the struggle of liberty and ambition.

The Dutch East-India company notwithstanding those factions, built Batavia in 1618, in spite of the kings of that country, and in spite of the English who attacked this new settlement. The Dutch, though born in a marshy, and in a great measure barren country, were erecting a kingdom under the fifth degree of North latitude, in the most fruitful part of the globe, where the fields are covered with rice, pepper and cinnamon; and where the vine bears fruit twice a year. They made themselves masters afterwards of Bantam in the

the same island, and drove the English from thence. This single company had eight large governments in the Indies, including the Cape of Good Hope, though at the most southern point of Africa; an important post which they took from the Portuguese in 1651.

At the same time that the Dutch were establishing themselves at the extremity of the East, they began to extend their conquests westward in America, after the expiration of the twelve years truce with Spain.

Their West-India Company between the years 1623 and 1636, made themselves masters of almost the whole country of Brasil. It was amazing to see, by the registers of that company, that, in so short a space of time, she had fitted out eight hundred ships, as well for war as commerce, and had taken five hundred and forty-five sail from the Spaniards. This company was then superior to that of the East-Indies; but, when the Portuguese shook off the Spanish yoke, they defended their possessions better than the kings of Spain had done; and retook Brazil, where they have discovered new treasures.

The most profitable of all the Dutch expeditions was that of admiral Peter Hein, who took the whole fleet of 1628 galleons, upon their return from the Havannah; and by this single voyage brought home twenty millions of livres. The treasures of the new world, which had been conquered by the Spaniards, only served to enable their former subjects, now grown a powerful enemy, to make head against them. During the space of fourscore years, if you except only the truce of twelve years, the republic maintained this war, in the low countries, in the East-Indies, and in the new world: she was also able to conclude an advantageous peace at Munster, in 1647, independently of France her ally, and long her protectress, notwithstanding she had promised to sign no treaty without the concurrence of this crown.

Soon after, that is in 1652, and the following years, she was not afraid to break with England her former ally: she fitted out as large a fleet as the English; when admiral Tromp yielded to the famous admiral Blake, only

only by losing his life in a sea engagement. She afterwards succoured the king of Denmark, who was besieged at Copenhagen by Charles X. king of Sweden. Her fleet, under the command of admiral Opdam, beat the Swedish squadron, and raised the siege of Copenhagen. Still a rival to the English in commerce, she waged war against Charles II. as she had done before against Cromwell. She became the arbiter of crowns in 1668, and obliged Louis XIV. to conclude a peace with Spain. This same republic, at first so strongly attached to France, proved afterwards the support of Spain against this crown to the end of the seventeenth century. She continued a long time to have a principal share in the affairs of Europe. She rose after her fall: and though weakened at present, she subsists intirely by commerce, to which she owed her rise, without having made any conquest in Europe, except that of Maestricht, and a small wretched country, which serves to cover her frontiers. Since the peace of Munster, she has not at all increased: in which respect she bears a greater resemblance to the ancient republic of Tyre, powerful by her commerce only, than to Carthage, which had so many possessions in Africa; or to Venice, which had extended itself too much upon the terra firma.

C H A P. CLXXXVIII.

Of Denmark, Sweden, and Poland, in the Seventeenth Century.

YOU don't find that Denmark had any share in the system of Europe during the sixteenth century. Nothing remarkable happened in this country to attract the attention of other nations, since the solemn dethroning of the tyrant Christian II. This kingdom, consisting of Denmark and Norway, was a long time governed nearly in the same manner as Poland: it was an aristocracy,

aristocracy, over which presided an elective king. This is the ancient form of government that prevailed almost in every part of Europe. But in the year 1660, the states, in full assembly, conferred the hereditary right and absolute sovereignty on king Frederick III. Denmark is the only kingdom in the world, where the people themselves have established arbitrary power by a solemn act. Norway, though six hundred leagues in extent, did not render this nation powerful: a country of barren rocks cannot be very populous. The islands which constitute Denmark, are more fertile; but they had not yet received their present improvements. Little was it then expected that the Danes would erect an East-India company, and obtain a settlement at Tranquebar; that the king would be able to maintain thirty men of war, and an army of five and twenty thousand men. Governments are like the human species; they are long a forming. The spirit of commerce, industry, and œconomy, has been gradually introduced into this kingdom. I shall not take notice of the wars which Denmark has so often maintained against Sweden; there are scarce any vestiges of them to be seen; and I know you had much rather consider the manners of people, and their form of governments, than enter into a detail of murders, productive of no events worthy the attention of posterity.

The kings of Sweden were no more despotic than those of Denmark in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The four estates, composed of a thousand gentlemen, an hundred ecclesiastics, an hundred and fifty burghers, and about two hundred and fifty peasants, constituted the legislative power. They were strangers, as well as the inhabitants of Denmark and the rest of the North, to the titles of count, marquis, or baron, so common in the other parts of Europe. It was king Eric, son of Gustavus Vasa, that first introduced them towards the year 1561. Yet this Eric was far from being an absolute prince; he left behind him a memorable example of the misfortunes that attend the desire of despotism, without the capacity of attaining it. The

son of the restorer of Sweden was accused of several
 1569 crimes before the assembly of the states, and deposed by
 their unanimous sentence; as king Christian II. had been
 deposed in Denmark. They condemned him to perpet-
 ual imprisonment, and the crown was given to his bro-
 ther John.

As your principal design, amidst this variety of
 events, is to fix your attention on those occurrences
 which shew the manners and spirit of the times, it is
 proper to observe, that this king John, who was a ca-
 tholic, apprehending lest his brother's adherents should
 release him out of prison, and place him again upon
 the throne, sent a poisonous draught to him publickly,
 as the Turkish sultan sends a bowstring; he likewise
 gave orders for his being solemnly interred with his face
 uncovered, to the end, that nobody might question his
 death, or make use of his name to disturb the govern-
 ment.

1580 The Jesuit Possevin, whom pope Gregory XIII. ap-
 pointed Nuncio to Sweden and the rest of the northern
 kingdoms, imposed, as a penance on king John, for
 having poisoned his brother, that he should make but
 one meal on Wednesdays; a ridiculous penance, but
 which shews however the obligation of atoning for cri-
 minal actions. Those of king Eric had been punished
 more rigorously.

Neither king John nor the nuncio Possevin could re-
 store the catholic religion. King John, having an utter
 dislike to Lutheranism, tried to introduce the Greek
 communion; but with no better success. This prince
 had some tincture of learning, and he was almost the
 only man in his kingdom who dabbled in controversy.
 There was an university at Upsal; but it was reduced
 to two or three professors, without students. The na-
 tion had no taste but for arms; yet they had made no
 great progress in the military art. They did not begin
 to make use of artillery till the reign of Gustavus Vasa;
 and so little were they acquainted with the other arts,
 that when this king John was taken ill in 1592, he
 died for want of a physician; quite the reverse of other
 kings,

kings, who have often too many. At that time there was neither physician nor surgeon in Sweden. Only a few drugs were sold in grocer's shops, and taken at random. This was the case almost throughout the North. Mankind, far from being troubled with superfluous arts, had not as yet acquired even those that are reckoned necessary.

Yet Sweden at that time was likely to become very formidable. Sigismund, son of king John, was elected 1600 king of Poland eight years before the death of his father. The Swedes were then subduing Finland and Estonia. Sigismund, king of Sweden and Poland, bid fair for conquering all Muscovy, a country of very little strength at that time, being defended by indifferent troops: yet, as Sigismund continued to be a catholic, and the Swedes Lutherans, he conquered nothing; but instead of that he lost the crown of Sweden. The same 1604 states of the kingdom who had deposed his uncle Eric, deposed him likewise, and conferred the crown on another uncle of his, who was Charles IX. father of the great Gustavus-Adolphus. All this did not happen without disturbances, wars, and conspiracies, with which such revolutions are generally attended. Charles IX. was looked upon as an usurper by the princes in alliance with Sigismund; but in Sweden he was their lawful king.

His son Gustavus-Adolphus succeeded him without 1611 difficulty, before he had attained his eighteenth year complete, which is the age of majority for the kings of Sweden and Denmark, as well as for the princes of the empire. The Swedes were not then possessed of Scania, their best province; it had been ceded to Denmark so long ago as the fourteenth century; so that the Swedish territory was generally the theatre of every war between the two crowns. The first thing Gustavus Adolphus did, was to march an army into this province of Scania; but he never could recover it. His expeditions in the beginning of his reign were unsuccessful; and he was obliged to conclude a peace with Denmark. But such 1613 was his passion for war, that he marched against the

Muscovites beyond the Narva, as soon as he had made peace with the Danes. The next thing he did was to
 1620 fall upon Livonia, which then belonged to the Poles; and attacking his cousin Sigismond in every quarter, he penetrated into Livonia. The emperor Ferdinand II. was Sigismond's ally, and dreaded Gustavus-Adolphus. He sent some troops against him. Thence we may judge, that the French ministry had no great difficulty to persuade Gustavus to make a descent upon Germany. He concluded a truce with Sigismond and Poland, during which he preserved his conquests. We have already seen in what manner he shook the throne of Ferdinand II; and how he was snatched away in the flower of life, in the midst of his victories.

1632 His daughter Christina, a princess not less celebrated than Gustavus, after governing as gloriously as her father had fought, and after directing the treaties of Westphalia which pacified the troubles of Germany, surprized all the world by abdicating her crown at the age of seven and twenty. Puffendorff says she was obliged to lay it down: but at the same time he acknowledges, that, when this princess communicated her resolution the first time to the senate in 1651, the members conjured her with tears not to forsake the kingdom; that she nevertheless continued resolute in her contempt of the throne; and at length, having convened the
 May, states, she quitted Sweden, notwithstanding the intreaties of
 21, all her subjects. She had never discovered any incapacity of wearing the crown; but she was fond of the
 N. S. city of wearing the crown; but she was fond of the
 1654 polite arts. Had she been queen of Italy, the country to which she retired, she never would have abdicated. This is the strongest example of the real superiority of the liberal arts, and the improvements of society, over mere state and grandeur.

Her cousin, Charles X. duke of Deux Ponts, was chosen by the states to succeed her. This prince delighted in nothing but war. He marched into Poland, and conquered it with the same rapidity, as it was conquered in our days by his grandson Charles XII; and he lost it as suddenly. The Danes, at that time the defenders

ders of Poland, because they were ever enemies to Sweden, fell upon him; but Charles, though driven out of Poland, marched over the frozen Sound, from island to island, and appeared before Copenhagen. This surprising expedition produced a peace at length, whereby Sweden recovered Scania, after having been dispossessed of it three centuries. 1658

His son Charles XI. was the first absolute king, and his grandson Charles XII. the last. Here I shall observe only one thing, which proves how greatly the spirit of government has changed in the North, and what a length of time was requisite to produce this revolution. It was not till after the death of Charles XII. that the Swedes, who had always been a military people, betook themselves to agriculture and commerce, so far as an ungrateful soil and the mediocrity of their circumstances would permit. They have at length established an East-India company; and their iron, which heretofore they used only as an instrument of destruction, is now exported on board their ships as merchandize, from the port of Gottenburgh to the southern provinces of India and China.

Here is another strange vicissitude and contrast in the affairs of the North. Sweden, which was so despotically governed, is of late become the most free kingdom in the world and that in which the king is most dependent on his people*: while on the contrary, Denmark, where the king had formerly no more authority than a doge, and where the sovereign power was vested in the nobles, and the common people were all slaves, has since the year 1661, been an absolute monarchy. The clergy and burghers chose rather to submit to an absolute sovereign than to an hundred nobles, every one of whom was for having the chief command; and accordingly they obliged the nobles to become subjects as well as themselves, and to invest their king Frederick III. with an unlimited authority. And he was the only monarch in the universe who, by the formal consent of all the orders

* Sweden was made an absolute monarchy again by the present king, in 1772. T.

of the kingdom, was acknowledged as absolute master of the people and the laws, "which he might either make, annul, or neglect, according to his own will." This formidable power was committed into his hands in a juridical manner, and happily his successors have not abused it. They have been sensible that their true greatness consisted in the happiness of their subjects. Sweden and Denmark have cultivated trade by methods diametrically opposite to each other; the former by making themselves free, the latter by giving up their liberties.

C H A P. CLXXXIX.

Of Poland in the seventeenth Century, and of the Socinians or Unitarians.

POLAND was the only country, which combining the name of a republic with that of monarchy, always chose a foreign king, as the Venetians chose their general. This is also the only kingdom that has not been actuated by the spirit of conquest, confining its views to the defending of its frontiers against the Turks and the Muscovites.

The catholic and protestant factions, which had raised such disturbances in other countries, penetrated at length into this kingdom. The protestants were so considerable as to insist upon liberty of conscience in 1587, which they obtained; and such was the weight of their party, that the pope's nuncio, Annibal of Capua, made use of their interest only, in endeavouring to convey the crown to the archduke Maximilian, brother to the emperor Rodolphus II. Accordingly, the Polish protestants chose this Austrian prince, while the opposite faction elected Sigismond the Swede, grandson of Gustavus Vasa, of whom we have been speaking. Sigismond would have been king of Sweden if the rights of blood had been consulted; but we have seen how the

the states of that nation disposed of the throne. So far was he from reigning in Sweden, that his cousin Gustavus-Adolphus had like to have dethroned him in Poland, and did not relinquish this enterprize but with a view of deposing the emperor.

It is amazing that the Swedes should so often overrun Poland, while the Turks, a more powerful nation, could never penetrate beyond the frontiers. In the reign of Sigismund, sultan Osman attacked the Poles with two hundred thousand men, on the side of Moldavia; but the Cossacks, the only people at that time attached to the republic, and under her protection, made so obstinate a resistance, as frustrated the designs of the Turks. What are we to conclude from the bad success of so great an armament, but that Osman's captains did not understand the art of war?

Sigismund died the same year as Gustavus-Adolphus. 1632 His son and successor Ladislaus saw the fatal defection of those Cossacks, who, after having been for many years the bulwark of the republic, at length submitted themselves to the Russians and the Turks. These people, whom we must distinguish from the Cossacks of the river Don, are settled on both banks of the Boristhenes; they lead exactly the same life as that of the ancient Scythians or of the Tartars in the neighbourhood of the Euxine sea. All this part of the world to the north and the east of Europe was still savage and wild; this is the image of the pretended heroic ages, when mankind, contenting themselves with necessaries, procured them by plundering their neighbours. The Polish lords of the palatinates bordering on the Ukraine, wanted to treat some of the Cossacks as their vassals, that is, as slaves. The whole nation, whose sole possession was liberty, rose up with one accord, and ravaged for a long time the lands of the republic. Those Cossacks were of the Greek religion, which was a further reason for their becoming irreconcilable enemies to Poland. Some of them surrendered themselves to the Russians, others to the Turks, upon condition, however, of being permitted to enjoy their anarchy. They still preserve what little

little religion they had of the Greeks; while they have intirely lost their liberty under the empire of Russia, which, after being civilized herself in our days, has endeavoured to civilize the Cossacks likewise.

King Ladislaus died without leaving any issue by his wife Mary Louisa of Gonzaga, the same who was in love with Cinq-Mars, master of the horse to Louis XIII. Ladislaus had two brothers, both in orders; one a Jesuit and cardinal, named John Casimir; the other bishop of Breslau and Kiow. The cardinal and the bishop
 1648 disputed the crown. Casimir was elected; upon which he sent back his cardinal's hat, and ascended the throne of Poland. But after a reign of twenty years, during which his kingdom was constantly a prey to domestic factions, and ravaged alternately by Charles X. king of Sweden, or by the Muscovites and Cossacks, he followed the example of queen Christina, in abdicating
 1668 the crown, but with less glory than that princess, and, retiring to Paris, he died abbot of St. Germain des Prés.

Poland was equally unhappy under his successor Michael Coribut. The territory which this republic has been stripped of at different times, would compose a very extensive kingdom. The Swedes had deprived her of Livonia, which the Russians possess at present together with Courland. Those same Russians, after having heretofore dispossessed her of the provinces Pleskou and Smolenskou, made themselves masters of almost all Kiow and the Ukraine. During Michael's
 1672 reign the Turks took Podolia and Volhinia. The republic had no other way to maintain itself than by paying tribute to the Port. It is true that the great marshal of the crown, John Sobieski, cancelled this disgrace with Turkish blood at the famous battle of
 1674 Chokzim, which delivered Poland from the tribute, and procured Sobieski the crown: but, in all probability, this battle, though so much celebrated, was neither so bloody nor so decisive as it has been reported, since the Turks for that time kept Podolia, and part of

the Ukraine, with the important fortress of Kaminiak, which they had taken from the Poles.

It is true that Sobieski, upon ascending the throne of Poland, immortalized his name by raising the siege of Vienna; but he was never able to recover Kaminiak; and the Turks did not restore it till after his decease, at the peace of Carlowitz in 1699. During all those convulsions, Poland neither changed its government, its laws, or its manners, neither grew richer, nor poorer: but her military discipline falling still very short of perfection, and Peter the Great having greatly improved his subjects in the art of war, by means of foreign officers, the consequence has been, that the Russians, who were formerly so despised by Poland, at length, in 1733, obliged the latter to accept of whomsoever they thought proper to nominate to the crown; and ten thousand Muscovites gave law to the whole body of the Polish nobility.

In regard to religion, it hath occasioned but very little disturbance in this part of the world. Towards the beginning of the seventeenth century the Unitarians had some churches in Poland and Lithuania. These Unitarians, who are sometimes called Socinians, at other times Arians, pretended to maintain the cause of the Deity, by considering him as a single, and incommunicable Being, who had only an adoptive son. This was not strictly the doctrine of the ancient Eusebians. They pretended to revive primitive Christianity, by renouncing civil dignities and the profession of arms. A sect that scrupled to fight, did not seem proper for a country, where the inhabitants were continually at war with the Turks. Yet this religion continued to prevail pretty much in Poland till the year 1658, when it was suppressed, because its followers would intrigue, though they would not fight. They were connected with Ragotski, prince of Transylvania, who was at that time an enemy to the republic. Still there are great numbers of them in Poland, though they are debarred the liberty of public worship.

The declaimer Maimbourg pretends that they took shelter in Holland, "Where, says he, all religions are "tolerated except the catholic." The declaimer Maimbourg is mistaken in this as well as in many other articles. So far are the catholics from not being tolerated in the United Provinces, that they constitute one-third of the inhabitants; while the Unitarians or Socinians, were never allowed any place of public worship. This religion has privately gained ground in Holland, in Transylvania, Silesia, Poland, and especially in England. We may reckon it among the revolutions of the human mind, that this which was the predominant religion for the space of three hundred and fifty years after the reign of Constantine, has appeared again within these two centuries, and spread through so many provinces without having so much as a single temple at this time in any part of the world. It would seem as if the several states of Christendom were afraid to tolerate an opinion, which had formerly reigned so long triumphant over all other communions.

C H A P. CX.

Of Russia in the sixteenth and seventeenth Centuries.

WE did not at that time give the name of Russia to Muscovy; for we had only a very confused idea of this country. The town of Moscow was better known in Europe than any other part of this vast empire, and from thence it had its name. The sovereign still takes the title of emperor of all the Russias, because in fact there are several provinces so called, which either belong to him, or to which he hath pretensions*.

Muscovy or Russia was governed in the sixteenth century much in the same manner as Poland. The boyars,

* See *The History of Peter the Great.* V.

as well as the Polish nobility, considered the tenants upon their estates as their sole property and wealth. The husbandmen were their slaves. The czar was oftentimes chosen by those boyars; but he used also sometimes to nominate his successor; which was never practised in Poland. Artillery was very little used in this part of the world during the sixteenth century; they were strangers to military discipline; each boyar led his peasants to the rendezvous appointed for the troops, where he armed them with bows and arrows, sabres, pikes, and some fusils. They never carried on any regular operations; they had neither magazines nor hospitals. All they did was by incursions; and when there was nothing more to plunder, the boyar as well as the Polish starost, and the Tartar mirza, brought back his troops.

To till their lands, to lead their flocks to pasture, and to fight, was the life of the Russians till the reign of Peter the Great, and is still the life of three-fourths of the inhabitants of the earth.

The Russians, about the middle of the sixteenth century, made an easy conquest of the kingdoms of Casan and Astracan from the Tartars, who were weaker and worse disciplined than them. But, till the reign of Peter the Great, the Russians could never maintain their ground against Sweden, on the side of Finland: regular troops used always to beat them. From the time of John Basilowitz, or Basilides, who conquered Astracan and Casan, with part of Livonia, Pleskou and Novogorod, to the reign of the czar Peter I. there happened nothing considerable.

This Basilides, resembled Peter I. in this, that they both put their sons to death. John Basilides suspecting his son of a conspiracy during the siege of Pleskou, killed him with his pike; and Peter, having caused his son to be condemned to death, would not suffer him to survive the sentence, though he seemed to forgive him.

History hardly furnishes a more extraordinary event, than that of the pretender Demetrius, who raised such

disturbances in Russia after the death of John Basilides,
 1584 This czar left two sons; one named Fedor or Theodore, the other Demetri or Demetrius. Fedor succeeded his father; and Demetrius was confined to a village called Uglis, with the czarina his mother. As yet the rude manners of that court, had not like the Turkish sultans and the ancient Greek emperors, adopted the policy of sacrificing the princes of the blood to the security of the throne. A prime minister, named Boris-Gudenou, whose sister had been married to the czar Fedor, persuaded his master, that he would never reign quietly unless he imitated the Turks, and assassinated his brother. An officer was therefore sent to the village, where young Demetrius was brought up, with orders to kill him. The officer, at his return, said he had executed his commission, and demanded the reward that had been promised him. All the reward Boris gave the murderer was to kill him also, in order to suppress every proof of the guilt. It is said that Boris poisoned the czar Fedor sometime after; and, though he was suspected of the crime, yet this did not prevent his ascending the throne.

1597 There appeared at that time in Lithuania, a young man who pretended to be prince Demetrius, that had escaped out of the hands of the assassin. Several, who had seen him at his mother's, knew him again by particular marks. He bore a perfect resemblance to the prince; he shewed the golden cross enriched with precious stones, that had been tied about Demetrius's neck. The palatine of Sandomir immediately acknowledged him for the son of John Basilides, and for the lawful czar. The diet of Poland made a solemn inquiry into the proofs of his royal extraction; and, finding them past all doubt, lent him an army to drive out the usurper Boris, and to recover the throne of his ancestors.

In the mean while Demetrius was treated in Russia as an impostor, and even as a magician. The Russians could not believe that a Demetrius, who was supported by the Poles, a catholic nation, and who had two Je-

suits

suits for his council, could be their real king. So little did the boyars question his being an impostor, that, upon the decease of the czar Boris, they made no difficulty to place his son, then only fifteen years of age, on the throne.

During these transactions, Demetrius was upon his ¹⁶⁰⁵ march into Russia, with a Polish army. They who were dissatisfied with the Muscovite government, declared in his favour. A general of that nation, advancing within sight of Demetrius's army, cried out, "he is the only lawful heir of the empire," and immediately went over to him with the troops under his command. The revolution was sudden and complete; and Demetrius ceased to be a magician. The inhabitants of Moscow ran to the palace, and dragged the young Boris and his mother to prison. Demetrius was pro- ¹⁶⁰⁵ claimed czar without opposition. It was given out that young Boris and his mother had killed themselves in prison; but it is more likely that Demetrius put them to death.

The widow of John Basilides, mother of the real or pretended Demetrius, had been banished long since to the North of Russia; the new czar sent a kind of coach, as magnificent as any that could be had at that time, to bring her to Moscow. He went himself part of the way to meet her; they embraced each other with transports and tears of joy in the presence of a prodigious multitude; so that no body doubted but Demetrius was the lawful emperor. He married the daughter of the ¹⁶⁰⁶ palatine of Sandomir, his first protector; and this was what ruined him. The people were shocked to see a catholic empress, a court composed of foreigners, and, above all, a church built for the Jesuits: so that Demetrius was no longer looked upon as a Russian.

In the midst of the entertainments at the marriage of the czar, a boyar, whose name was Ziski, put himself at the head of a number of conspirators, who, entering the palace, with the sword in one hand, and a cross in the other, cut the Polish guard in pieces. Demetrius was loaded with chains. The conspirators confronted him

him with the czarina, widow of John Basilides, who had so solemnly acknowledged him for her son. The clergy obliged her to declare upon oath the real truth in regard to Demetrius. Whether it was that the apprehension of death forced this princess to take a false oath, and to get the better of nature, or whether she did it out of regard to the real truth, she confessed, with tears in her eyes, that the czar was not her son, that the real Demetrius had been murdered in his infancy, that she had only followed the example of the whole nation in acknowledging the new czar, and to be revenged for the blood of her son upon a family of assassins. Demetrius was now said to be a low fellow, named *Grisba Utropoya*, who had been for some time a monk in a Russian convent. Before, they used to reproach him with not following the Greek religion, and with differing intirely from the customs and manners of Russia; but now, they called him a Russian peasant, 1606 and a Greek monk. Let him be what he would, Zuski, the chief of the conspirators, killed him with his own hand, and succeeded to the empire.

This new czar, having suddenly mounted the throne, sent back the few Poles, that had escaped the massacre, to their own country. As he had no other right to the crown, than that of having assassinated Demetrius, the rest of the boyars dissatisfied with being subject to a person so lately their equal, soon pretended that the deceased czar was not an impostor, but the real Demetrius, and that the murderer was unworthy of the throne. The name of Demetrius became dear to the Russians. The chancellor of the late czar declared, that he was not dead, but would quickly recover of his wounds, and appear again at the head of his loyal subjects.

This chancellor made a progress through Muscovy, with a young man in a litter, whom he called Demetrius, and treated as his sovereign. At the very sound of Demetrius's name the people rose up; they fought some battles in behalf of his cause, without so much as seeing him; but the chancellor's party having been defeated, this second Demetrius soon disappeared. However,

ever, the people were so mad after the name, that a third Demetrius presented himself in Poland. This man was more fortunate than the rest: being supported by Sigismond king of Poland, he laid siege to Moscow, where Zuski resided. The tyrant was shut up in this capital; but he had still in his power the widow of the first Demetrius, and the palatine of Sandomir, that widow's father. The third Demetrius demanded the princess as his wife. Zuski delivered up both the father and the daughter, hoping perhaps to soften the king of Poland; or flattering himself that the palatine's daughter would not acknowledge the impostor. But this impostor was victorious; the widow of the first declared this third Demetrius to be her real husband; so as the first of that name found out his mother, the third as easily found out his wife. The palatine swore that this was his son-in-law; and the people made no longer any doubt of it. The boyars, divided betwixt the usurper Zuski and the impostor, would acknowledge neither. They deposed Zuski, and shut him up in a convent. This was still a superstition of the Russians, as it had been of the ancient Greek church, that a prince who had been once a monk, was incapable of ever reigning again: and this same opinion had been insensibly introduced into the Latin church. Zuski appeared no more; and Demetrius was assassinated at a public entertainment by a party of Tartars.

The boyars then offered their crown to prince Ladislaus, son of Sigismond, king of Poland. Ladislaus was preparing to take possession, when behold a fourth Demetrius started up, and entered the lists with him. This man gave out, that God had constantly preserved him, though he had been in all appearance assassinated at Uglis by the tyrant Boris, at Moscow by the usurper Zuski, and afterwards by the Tartars. He found partisans that believed in those three miracles. The town of Pleskou acknowledged him as czar; here he fixed his residence a few years; during which time the Russians repeating they had called in the Poles, drove them back again; and Sigismond renounced all hopes of
seeing

seeing his son Ladislaus seated on the throne of Russia. In the midst of these disturbances, the son of the patriarch Fedor Romanow was made czar. This patriarch was related by the females to the czar John Basilides. His son, Michael Federowitz, that is, son of Fedor, was chosen to this dignity at the age of seventeen, by his father's influence. All Russia acknowledged this Federowitz, and the city of Pleskou delivered up the fourth Demetrius, who was hanged.

There remained still a fifth, the son of the first, who had been really czar, and married the daughter of the palatine of Sandomir. His mother removed him from Moscow, when she went to meet the third Demetrius, and pretended to acknowledge him for her real husband. 1613 She retired afterwards among the Cossacks along with this child, who was looked upon, and might be really the grandson of John Basilides: but as soon as Michael Federowitz was seated on the throne, he obliged the Cossacks to deliver up the mother and the child, who were both drowned.

One would not have expected a sixth Demetrius. Yet, during the reign of Michael Federowitz in Russia, and of Ladislaus in Poland, another pretender of this name appeared in the czar's dominions. As some young people were bathing one day with a Cossack of their own age, they took notice of Russian characters on his back, which were pricked with a needle: and they found them to be, "Demetrius son of the czar Demetrius." He was supposed to be the same son of the first Demetrius, by the Palatine of Sandomir's daughter, whom the czar Federowitz had ordered to be drowned. God had operated a miracle to save him; he was treated as the czar's son at the court of Ladislaus; and they intended to make use of him in order to excite fresh disturbances in Russia. The death of his protector Ladislaus blasted all his hopes. He retired first to Sweden, and from thence to Holstein; but, unfortunately for this adventurer, the duke of Holstein having sent an embassy into Russia, in order to open a communication for a silk trade with Persia, and the ambassa-

dor

der having had no other success but to contract debts at Moscow, the duke of Holstein discharged the debts by delivering up this last Demetrius, who was quartered alive.

These adventures, which have the appearance of being fabulous, and yet are extremely true, do not happen to a civilized nation, that has a regular form of government. The czar Alexis, son of Michael Fedorowicz, and grandson of the patriarch Fedor Romanow, crowned in 1645, is hardly known in Europe, only as being the father of Peter the Great. 'Till the reign of this last prince, Russia was a country with which the people of the south of Europe were but little acquainted, a country that lay buried under the wretched despotism of the prince over the boyars, and of these over the husbandmen. The abuses of which civilized nations complain in our time, would have been looked upon as excellent laws for the Russians. There are some regulations with us, that create complaints among merchants and manufacturers: but in those northern regions, it was very rare to have a bed; the people lay upon boards, which some not so poor as the rest used to cover with coarse cloth, bought at foreign fairs; or with the skin of some animal. When the earl of Carlisle, ambassador from Charles II. king of England to the court of Moscow, travelled through the whole empire of Russia, from Archangel to Poland, in 1663, he found this custom, and the general poverty which it supposeth, every where established; while at court there was a gaudy display of gold and diamonds, without taste or elegance.

A grim Tartar, or a don Cossack, reduced to the savage life of a Russian, was still happier than this Russian, because he was free to go wherever he pleased; whereas the other was forbid to leave his country upon pain of death. By the history of Charles XII. and that of Peter I. which is included therein, you may perceive the immense difference which half a century hath produced in this empire. Thirty centuries would

not have effected what Peter did by travelling a few years.

C H A P. CXCI.

*Of the Ottoman Empire in the seventeenth Century.—
Siege of Candia.—False Messiah.*

1585 **T**HE Turks, after the death of Selim II. preserved their superiority in Europe and Asia. They extended their frontiers still further, under Amurath III. His generals took Raab in Hungary on one side, and Tibris in Persia on the other. The janizaries had been not only formidable to their enemies, but to their masters: Amurath III. let them see that he was worthy to command them. One day they demanded the head of the testerdar, that is, of the high treasurer. They were making a riot before the inner gate of the seraglio, and threatened the sultan himself: he 1593 ordered the gate to be thrown open; when, followed by all the officers of the seraglio, he rushed out with his sabre, and killed several; the rest dispersed and submitted. This proud corps tamely beheld the execution of the ringleaders of the insurrection. But what sort of soldiers must they have been, whom their master was obliged to fight! Sometimes they could be checked; but there was no possibility of breaking them to the yoke, or training them to discipline, or of entirely abolishing them: nay, so great was their power that they often disposed of the empire.

Mahomet III. son of Amurath, deserved more than any other sultan, that the janizaries should make him feel the weight of their usurped privilege of judging their masters. We are told that he begun his reign with strangling nineteen of his brothers, and drowning twelve of his father's concubines, who were supposed to be pregnant: and yet there was hardly the least complaint heard. None but those who are not possessed

of

of power, meet with the punishment due to their crimes. This barbarian reigned in splendor. He protected Transylvania against the emperor Rodolphus II. who neglected the care of his dominions and of the empire; he ravaged Hungary; he took Agria in sight of the arch-¹⁵⁹⁶ duke Matthias; and, though his administration was stained with cruelty, he supported the Ottoman grandeur.

During the reign of his son Achmet I. from 1603 to ¹⁶⁰³ 1631, this empire was upon the decline. Shah-Abbas the Great, king of Persia, was constantly victorious over the Turks. He dispossessed them of Tauris, the ancient theatre of war between the Turks and Persians; he drove them out of all their conquests, and thereby delivered Rodolphus, Matthias, and Ferdinand II. from inquietude. He fought for the christians unknown to him. In 1615, Achmet concluded a shameful peace with the emperor Matthias, to whom he surrendered Agra, Canisa, Pest, and Alba Regalis, the conquests of his ancestors. Such are the vicissitudes of fortune. Thus it was that Ussum Cassan, and Ismael Sophi, stopped the progress of the Turks against the empire and against Venice; and thus, before that time, did Tamerlane save Constantinople.

What passed after the death of Achmet clearly proves, that the Turkish government was not that absolute monarchy, or despotic state, represented by our historians. This power was in the sultan's hands, like a two-edged sword, which hurts the owner, if he happens to be unskilful in wielding it. The empire was oftentimes, as count Marfigli says, a military democracy, that is, a government still worse than absolute monarchy. The order of succession was not settled; the janizaries and the divan did not chuse the son of Achmet, whose name ¹⁶¹⁷ was Osman, for their emperor, but Mustapha brother of Achmet. At the expiration of two months they took a dislike to Mustapha, who they pretended was incapable of governing: upon which they confined him, and proclaimed young Osman his nephew, then but in

his twelfth year; so that they really governed in his name.

Mustapha, though close confined, had still a party, who persuaded the janizaries, that young Osman had a design to reduce their number, in order to weaken their power. Upon this pretence Osman was deposed; they committed him to the seven
1622 towers, whither the grand vizir Daoust went himself to assassinate his sovereign. Mustapha was released from his confinement a second time, and proclaimed sultan; but within a twelvemonth he was dethroned again by the same janizaries, who had elected him twice. Never prince, since Vitellius, was treated with more ignominy. He was conducted through the streets of Constantinople upon an ass, exposed to the insolence of the mob, shut up in the seven towers, and at length strangled in prison.

Under Amurath IV. surnamed *Gasi*, or *the intrepid*, things assumed a different turn. This prince made the
1628 janizaries respect him, by leading them against the Dec. Persians, whom he dispossessed of Erzerum. Ten years
12, after he stormed Bagdat, the ancient Seleucia, and capital of Mesopotamia, which we call Diarbek; it has
1638 still continued in the hands of the Turks, as well as Erzerum. The Persians ever since have thought proper to secure their frontiers by laying the country waste, the whole space of thirty leagues beyond Bagdat, thus converting the most fruitful province of Persia into a barren wild. Other nations defend their frontiers by citadels; the Persians secure theirs by deserts.

At the same time that Amurath was taking Bagdat, he sent forty thousand men to the assistance of the great mogul Shah-Gean against his son Aurengzeb. Had this torrent, which overwhelmed Asia, broke into Germany, at that time a prey to the Swedes and French, and weakened by its own divisions, this country would have been in great danger of losing the glory of having never been intirely subdued.

The Turks acknowledge that this conqueror had no other merit than his valour, that he was cruel, and that his intemperance increased his cruelty; a drunken fit put an end to his days, and dishonoured his memory. 1639

His son Ibrahim was subject to the same vices as his father, with greater weakness, and no courage. Yet it was in this reign that the Turks conquered the isle of Candia, when nothing more was left to take but the capital and a few forts, which defended themselves four and twenty years. This island, which is so famous in ancient history, under the name of Crete, for its laws, its arts, and even its fables, had been conquered by the Mahometan Arabians in the beginning of the ninth century. They built the city of Candia, from whence the whole island has since taken its name. The Greek emperors drove them from thence at the end of four-score years; but, at the time of the crusades, when the Latin princes entered into a league to succour Constantinople, and when, instead of defending, they plundered the Greek empire, the Venetians purchased the isle of Candia, and were so fortunate as to keep it.

An adventure of a very singular nature, and which has something of the air of a romance, drew the Ottoman arms upon Candia. Six Maltese galleys had taken a Turkish vessel, and put in with their prize to a port of this island, named Calismene. It is pretended that this Turkish vessel had a son of the grand seignior on board: what led people to adopt this opinion was, that the Kishlar aga, or chief of the black eunuchs, with several officers of the seraglio, were on board the same vessel, and that this child was attended with extraordinary respect. The Kishlar aga having been killed in the engagement, the officers declared that the infant belonged to Ibrahim, and that his mother was sending him to Egypt. At Malta they treated him a long time as the sultan's son, in expectation of a ransom proportioned to his high-birth. The sultan never would vouchsafe to propose a ransom; whether it was that he did not chuse to treat at all, or that the prisoner was not

not really his son. At length this pretended prince, being neglected by the Maltese, became a Dominican friar, and was long known by the name of the Ottoman father: the Dominicans have boasted ever since that the son of a sultan was a member of their order.

The Turks, unable to take their revenge of Malta, whose inaccessible rocks bid defiance to the whole Ottoman power, wreaked their indignation upon Venice. They charged this republic with having admitted the Maltese prize into their port, contrary to the treaties betwixt the two powers. A Turkish fleet appeared before Candia: their troops landed and made themselves
 1645 masters of Canea, and, in a very little time, of almost the whole island.

Sultan Ibrahim had no share in this event. The greatest enterprizes have been performed sometimes under the weakest princes. The janizaries were absolute masters in the reign of Ibrahim: they made conquests, not for him, but for themselves and the empire. At length this prince was deposed by the decision of the
 1648 musti and the divan. The Turkish empire was then a downright democracy; for, after confining the sultan to the apartment of his women, they proclaimed no other emperor, but continued the administration in the name of a sultan whom they would no longer suffer to reign.

1649 Our historians pretend that Ibrahim was at length strangled by four mutes, from a vulgar error that mutes are employed to execute the sanguinary orders of the seraglio, but they have always been upon the footing of buffoons and dwarfs, and are never employed in any serious commission. The story of this prince's having been strangled by four mutes, we must look upon as a romance: the Turkish annals do not mention how he died; it is a secret of the seraglio. The many falsities that have been told of the government of the Turks, a nation as it were in our neighbourhood, ought to render us very mistrustful in regard to ancient history. What can we expect to know of the Scythians, the Gomarites, and the Celtes, when we are so ill-informed

formed of transactions near home? Upon the whole, in reading the history of nations, we ought to be satisfied with the knowledge of public events; for it will be only losing time to enter into private details, except when transmitted by ocular and credible witnesses.

By a singular fatality, this period, which was so fatal to Ibrahim, was the same to all crowned heads. The famous war of thirty years had shaken the imperial throne of Germany. France was torn by civil dissensions, which obliged the mother of Louis XIV. to fly with her children from the capital. In England Charles I. was condemned to death by his own subjects. Philip IV. king of Spain, after losing almost all his possessions in Asia, had been likewise stripped of Portugal. The beginning of the seventeenth century was the æra of usurpers, almost from one extremity of the globe to the other. Cromwell made himself master of England, Scotland and Ireland. A rebel, whose name was Litching, obliged the last emperor of the Chinese race to strangle himself, together with his wife and children; which opened a passage into China to the Tartar conquerors. In India, Aurengzeb rebelled against his father, who died of a lingering death in prison, while the son enjoyed in peace the fruit of his iniquity. Mulei-Ismael, the greatest of tyrants, was practising the most horrid cruelties in the empire of Morocco. Of all the kings upon earth, those two usurpers, Aurengzeb and Mulei-Ismael, lived the happiest and the longest. They were both above an hundred years old when they died. Cromwell, though as wicked as either of them, did not live so long, but ruled and died in peace. If we examine into the history of the world, we shall find weak princes unfortunate, and great villains successful; as if the globe were a vast scene of plunder and devastation, abandoned to fortune and caprice.

The siege of Candia was like that of Troy. The Turks sometimes menaced the town, and sometimes were besieged themselves in Canea, which they had made their principal fortress. Never did the Venetians shew more resolution or courage. They beat the Turkish fleet

fleet several times. The treasury of St. Mark was exhausted in levying troops. The disturbances of the seraglio, and the irruptions of the Turks into Hungary, occasioned the siege of Candia to go on but slowly for some years; but it was never intirely interrupted. At length, in 1667, Achmet Cuprogli, or Kiuperli, grand vizir to Mahomet IV. and son of a grand vizir, laid siege to Candia in form, defended at that time by the captain-general Francesco Morosini, and by *St. André Montbrun*, a French officer, whom the senate had entrusted with the command of her land forces.

Never would Candia have been taken, had the Christian princes but followed the example of Louis XIV. who in 1669 sent six or seven thousand men to the relief of this town, under the command of the dukes of Beaufort and Navailles. The harbour was always open; so that there needed nothing more than a constant supply of troops to withstand the attacks of the janizaries. The republic was not able to raise a sufficient number. The duke of Beaufort, the same who had acted a part more singular than illustrious in the civil wars during the king's minority, putting himself at the head of the French nobility, fell upon the Turks in their intrenchments, and spoiled all their works. But, a magazine of powder and granadoes happening to blow up in those intrenchments, the whole fruit of this gallant action was lost. The French, fancying the ground to be undermined, withdrew in some disorder, and were pursued by the Turks; the duke of Beaufort was killed in the action, together with a great number of French officers.

Thus did Louis XIV. though an ally of the Ottoman empire, openly assist the Venetians, and afterwards the Germans, against this empire; and yet the Turks did not seem to express any great resentment. It is not known for what reason this prince recalled his troops soon after from Candia. The duke of Navailles, on whom the command devolved after the death of the duke of Beaufort, was persuaded that the town could not hold out any longer. The captain-general Fran-

cesco

cel
siege
lati
by
for
side
pro
Ott
T
the
ashe
beh
nour
a tro
leave
to C
to re
board
to th
two l
Vene
day o
Cu
best g
and a
quire
Turks
dred t
The
the b
Benzo
marq
all ove
to tha
him, v
called
Greek
by a st
with pr
made a
and ge
Vol.

cesco Morosini, who had so long maintained this famous siege, might have abandoned the ruins without capitulating, and got off by sea which was always open. But by capitulating he preserved some places in the island for the republic; and besides, the capitulation was considered as a treaty of peace. The vizir Achmet Cuprogli placed his whole reputation, and the glory of the Ottoman arms, in taking Candia.

The vizir and Morosini therefore concluded a peace, the price of which was the town of Candia, reduced to ashes. Only about twenty infirm Christians were left behind. Never did the Christians make a more honourable capitulation with the Turks, nor was there ever a treaty better observed by the latter. Morosini had leave to carry off all the cannon that had been transported to Candia during the war. The vizir lent him vessels^{Sept.} to remove the inhabitants, who could not find room on¹⁶⁶⁹ board the Venetian ships. He gave five hundred sequins to the burgher that presented him with the keys, and two hundred to the rest of the retinue. The Turks and Venetians visited one another like allied nations till the day of the embarkation.

Cuprogli, the conqueror of Candia, was one of the best generals in Europe, one of the greatest ministers, and at the same time a man just and humane. He acquired immortal glory in this long war, in which the Turks themselves acknowledged they had lost two hundred thousand men.

The Morosini's, (for there were four of that name in the besieged city) the Cornaro's, the Giustiniani's, the Benzoni's, the marquis de St. André Montbrun, the marquis de Frontenac, rendered their names illustrious all over Europe. This siege has been justly compared to that of Troy. The grand vizir had a Greek with him, who merited the surname of Ulysses; he was called *Payanotos*. Prince Cantemir pretends that this Greek determined the council of Candia to capitulate, by a stratagem worthy of Ulysses. A French fleet, laden with provisions was upon its way to Candia. Payanotos made a number of Turkish ships hoist French colours, and get out to sea by night; the next day they came

into the road, where the Ottoman fleet lay at anchor, by whom they were received with shouts of joy. Payanotos, who was treating with the council of war at Candia, made them believe that the king of France had abandoned the republic, to oblige the Turks, his allies: and this stratagem forwarded the capitulation. Morosini, the captain-general, was accused before the senate of having betrayed his country. He was defended with as much vehemence, as was employed in his impeachment. This is still an imitation of the ancient republics of Greece, and especially of Rome. Morosini cleared himself afterwards by taking the Peloponnesus, now called the Morea, a conquest which the Venetians did not long enjoy. This great man died a doge, and left behind him a reputation likely to last as long as Venice.

Of Sabbatei-Sevi, who pretended to be the Messiah.

DURING the siege of Candia an affair happened among the Turks, that drew the attention of all Europe and Asia. A general rumour was spread at that time, founded on an idle curiosity, that the year 1666 was to be remarkable for some great revolution. The source of this opinion was the myltic number of 666, found in the book of Revelations. Never was the expectation of the antichrist so general. On the other hand the Jews pretended that their Messiah was to come this year.

A Smyrna Jew, named Sabbatei-Sevi, who was a man of some learning, and son of a rich broker belonging to the English factory, took advantage of this general opinion, and set up for the Messiah. He was eloquent, and of a graceful figure; he affected modesty, recommended justice, spoke like an oracle, and proclaimed, wherever he came, that the times were fulfilled. He travelled at first into Greece and Italy. At Leghorn he ran away with a girl, and carried her to Jerusalem, where he began to preach to his brethren. It is a standing tradition among the Jews, that their Shiloh or Messiah, their avenger and king, is not to appear till the coming of Elijah; and they are persuaded that

that they have had one Elijah, who is to appear again at the renewing of the world. This Elijah, or Elias, has by some learned persons been taken for the sun; on account of the conformity between this name and the word *Elios*, which in Greek signifies the sun; as also, from the story of Elijah's being carried up to heaven in a fiery chariot, drawn by four horses; which has a great resemblance of the poetical fiction of the chariot of the sun and his four horses. But without employing our time on such researches, or examining whether the Hebrew books were written after the time of Alexander, when the Jewish factors, residing in Alexandria, had learned something of the Grecian mythology; it is sufficient to remark that the Jews have been in expectation of the coming of Elijah from time immemorial; and to this very day, when these deluded people perform the ceremony of circumcision on a new born infant, they always place a chair for Elijah, in case he should please to honor them with his presence. Elijah, according to them, is to introduce the great sabbath, the great Messiah, and the general revolution of all things. This notion has been even received among Christians. Elijah is to come to declare the dissolution of this world, and a new order of things. Almost all the different sects of fanatics expect an Elijah. The prophets of the Cevennes, who came to London in 1707, to raise the dead, pretended to have seen Elijah, and to have spoken to him; and that he was to shew himself to the people. In 1724, the lieutenant of the police at Paris sent two Elijahs to prison, who fought with each other who should be accounted the true one. It was therefore necessary that Sabbatei-Sevi should be announced to his brethren by an Elijah, otherwise his pretended mission would have been treated as an imposture.

He met with one Nathan, a Jewish rabbi, who thought there was something to be gained by playing a part in this farce. Accordingly Sabbatei declared to the Jews of Asia Minor and Syria, that Nathan was Elijah; and Nathan on his part insisted that Sabbatei was the Messiah, the Shiloh, expected by the chosen people.

They both performed great works at Jerusalem, and reformed the synagogue. Nathan explained the prophecies, and demonstrated that at the expiration of that year the sultan would be dethroned, and Jerusalem become mistress of the world. All the Jews of Syria were convinced. The synagogues resounded with ancient prophecies. They grounded themselves on these words of Isaiah: "Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion, put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city: for henceforth, there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean." All the rabbies had the following passage in their mouths: "And they shall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord, out of all nations, upon horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and upon mules, and upon swift beasts, to my holy mountain Jerusalem." In short, their hopes were fed by these and a thousand other passages, which both women and children were for ever repeating. There was not a Jew but prepared lodgings for some of the ten dispersed tribes. So great was their enthusiasm, that they left off trade every where, and held themselves ready for the voyage to Jerusalem.

Nathan chose twelve men at Damascus, to preside over the twelve tribes. Sabbatei-Sevi went to shew himself to his brethren at Smyrna, and Nathan wrote to him thus; "King of kings, Lord of lords, when shall we be worthy to put ourselves under the shadow of your ass? I prostrate myself to be trod under the sole of your feet." At Smyrna, Sabbatei deposed some doctors of the law, who did not acknowledge his authority, and established others more tractable. One of his most violent enemies, named Samuel Pennia, was publicly converted, and proclaimed him to be the son of God. Sabbatei having presented himself one day before the cadi of Smyrna, with a multitude of his followers, they all declared they saw a column of fire betwixt him and the cadi. Some other miracles of this sort set his divine mission beyond all doubt. Numbers

see Chap.
52
23 7 48,

of
cio
he
cip
get
him
to C
obt
usu
at h
exh
com
that
refu
at G
that
subj
ing
" w
" yo
" en
Sa
visi
turb
were
appr
some
imag
Turk
King
to th
out,
his li
Hi
Euro
the J
Amst
and p
distrib

of Jews were impatient to lay their gold and their precious stones at his feet.

The bashaw of Smyrna would have arrested him; but he set out for Constantinople with his most zealous disciples. The grand vizir Achmet Cuprogli, who was getting ready for the siege of Candia, gave orders for him to be seized on board the vessel that brought him to Constantinople, and to be confined. The Jews easily obtained admittance into the prison for money, as is usual in Turkey; they went and prostrated themselves at his feet, and kissed his chains. He preached to them, exhorted them, and gave them his blessing, but never complained. The Jews of Constantinople, believing that the coming of the Messiah would cancel all debts, refused to pay their creditors. The English merchants at Galata waited upon Sabbatei in jail, and told him, that, as king of the Jews, he ought to command all his subjects to pay their debts. Sabbatei wrote the following words to the persons complained against: "To you, who expect the salvation of Israel, &c. discharge your lawful debts; if you refuse it, you shall not enter with us into our joy, and into our empire."

Sabbatei, during his imprisonment, was continually visited by his followers; who began to raise some disturbances in Constantinople. At that time the people were greatly dissatisfied with Mahomet IV. and it was apprehended that the Jewish prophecy might occasion some disturbance. Under these circumstances one would imagine, that such a severe government as that of the Turks, would have put the person, calling himself *King of Israel*, to death. Yet they only removed him to the castle of the Dardanells. The Jews then cried out, that it was not in the power of man to take away his life.

His fame had reached even the most distant parts of Europe; at the Dardanells he received deputations from the Jews of Poland, Germany, Leghorn, Venice, and Amsterdam: they paid very dear for kissing his feet; and probably this was what preserved his life. The distributions of the Holy Land were made very quietly in

in the tower of the Dardanells. At length the fame of his miracles was so great, that sultan Mahomet had the curiosity to see the man, and to examine him himself. The king of the Jews was brought to the seraglio. The sultan asked him in the Turkish language, *whether he was the Messiah*. Sabbatei modestly answered, *he was*; but as he expressed himself incorrectly in this tongue; "You speak very ill," said Mahomet to him, "for a Messiah, who ought to have the gift of languages. Do you perform any miracles?" "Sometimes," answered the other. "Well then," said the sultan, "let him be stripped stark naked; he will be a very good mark for the arrows of my pages, and if he is invulnerable, we will acknowledge him to be the Messiah." Sabbatei flung himself upon his knees, and confessed it to be a miracle above his strength. It was proposed to him immediately, either to be impaled, or to turn Mussulman, and go publicly to the Turkish mosque. He did not hesitate in the least, but embraced the Turkish religion directly. Then he preached that he had been sent to substitute the Turkish to the Jewish religion, pursuant to the ancient prophecies. Yet the Jews of distant countries believed in him a long time. The affair however was not attended with bloodshed, but increased the shame and confusion of the Jewish nation.

Some time after the Jews had been thus disgraced in the Ottoman empire, the Christians of the Latin church underwent a great affront. They had hitherto kept possession of the holy sepulchre at Jerusalem, by means of monies received from the princes of their communion, and especially from the king of Spain. But the same Payanotos, who had concluded the treaty for surrendering Candia, obtained of the grand vizir, Achmet Cuprogli, that henceforward the Greek church should have care of all the holy places in Jerusalem. The religious of the Latin communion opposed this grant. The cause was tried before the *cadi* at Jerusalem, and afterwards before the great divan at Constantinople. It was determined that the Greek church having considered Jerusalem as within her jurisdiction before the time of the

crusades,

crusades, her pretension was well founded. The trouble the Turks took to examine into the rights of their Christian subjects, and their suffering them to exercise their religion on the very spot where first it had its rise, is a particular instance of lenity in that sanguinary government. When the Greeks wanted to take possession in virtue of the decree of the divan, the Latins opposed them by force, and there was some blood spilt. The government punished no body with death on this occasion; a further proof of the humanity of the vizir Achmet Cuprogli, whose example has seldom been imitated. One of his predecessors in 1638, ordered Cyril the Greek patriarch of Constantinople to be strangled, upon the repeated accusations of his own flock. The lenity or cruelty of the times, is every where determined, by the character of those at the helm.

C H A P. CXCII.

Progress of the Turks. Siege of Vienna.

THE torrent of Ottoman power not only overspread Candia and the islands belonging to the republic of Venice, but oftentimes penetrated into Poland and Hungary. The same Mahomet IV. whose grand vizir had taken Candia, marched in person against the Poles, under pretence of protecting the Cossacks, whom they had treated very ill. He made himself master of the Ukraine, of Podolia, Volhinia, and the town of Kamieniek; and when he granted peace to the Poles, it was¹⁶⁷² upon condition of their paying the annual tribute of twenty thousand crowns, a tribute from which they were soon released by John Sobieski.

The Turks had given no disturbance to Hungary, during the war of thirty years, which ravaged Germany. Ever since 1541, they had been masters of both the banks of the Danube, almost as far as Buda inclusively. The Persian conquests of Amurath IV. prevented

prevented him from extending the use of his arms towards Germany. Transylvania belonged to princes, with whom the emperors Ferdinand II. and Ferdinand III. were obliged to keep fair, and who were tributary to the Turks. The remaining part of Hungary enjoyed its liberty. It was not so under the emperor Leopold: the upper Hungary and Transylvania were the theatre of revolutions, wars and devastation.

Of all the nations reviewed in this history, none have been more unfortunate than the Hungarians. Their country, divided between the catholic and protestant religions, and torn by different parties, was at the same time ravaged and impoverished by the Turkish and German armies. Ragotsky prince of Transylvania is said to have been the first cause of these misfortunes. He was tributary to the Port; and upon refusing to pay the tribute, a Turkish army invaded his country. The emperor Leopold sent Montecuculi against the Turks, a general who was afterwards the rival of Turenne. Louis XIV. marched a body of six thousand men to the assistance of the emperor of Germany
 1663 his natural enemy. They had a share in the famous battle of St. Gothard, where Montecuculi defeated the Turks. But notwithstanding this victory, the Port concluded an advantageous peace, whereby
 1664 she kept possession of Buda, Neuhausel, and Transylvania.

The Hungarians had no sooner got rid of the Turks, than they were for defending their rights and liberties against Leopold; but this emperor would allow of no rights except those of his crown. The kingdom was exposed to fresh disturbances. Emerick Tekeli, a young Hungarian nobleman, eager to avenge the blood of his friends and relations, which had been spilt by the court of Vienna, excited a revolt in the part of Hungary, subject to the emperor. He went over to the Turks, and Mahomet IV. declared him king of Upper Hungary. At that time the port had the bestowing of four crowns on Christian princes, namely,

nam
 dav
 T
 part
 Auf
 gran
 prog
 the
 ing
 his
 Tur
 a hu
 clusi
 the t
 nics
 hund
 gary
 tude.
 Must
 the g
 Vie
 men;
 troop
 burgh
 profes
 fician
 pold a
 Vienn
 wife,
 but in
 long
 Mustaf
 into an
 cied to
 contain
 the cul
 the far
 them as
 ed with
 nary su
 Vol.

namely, Hungary, Transylvania, Valachia, and Moldavia.

The execution of the Hungarian lords of Tekeli's party, had like to have been attended with the loss of Austria and Vienna to Leopold and his family. The grand vizir Cara Mustapha, successor of Achmet Cuproglu, was commissioned by Mahomet IV. to attack the emperor of Germany, under the pretence of avenging Tekeli's cause. The sultan himself went to review his troops in the plains of Adrianople. Never did the Turks raise a more numerous army; it consisted of above a hundred and forty thousand men, regular troops, exclusive of thirty thousand Crim Tartars, the volunteers, the train of artillery, with sutlers, servants, and mechanics of every kind, all together amounting to three hundred thousand men. The whole kingdom of Hungary was ransacked to find provisions for such a multitude. There was nothing to retard the march of Cara Mustapha's army: he advanced without opposition to the gates of Vienna, and laid siege to that capital. July 16, 1683

Vienna at that time had a garrison of sixteen thousand men; but there were not above eight thousand regular troops. The governor, count Staremberg, armed the burghers, and the members of the university. The professors and scholars mounted guard, and had a physician for their major. The flight of the emperor Leopold added to the terror of the inhabitants. He left Vienna the 7th of July with his mother-in-law, his wife, and the whole Imperial family. Vienna being but indifferently fortified, was not able to hold out a long siege. The Turkish annals pretend, that Cara Mustapha had a design to erect Vienna and Hungary into an empire independent of the sultan. He had fancied to himself that the seat of the German emperors contained immense treasures; and indeed it has been the custom of all the princes, from Constantinople to the farther limits of Asia, always to keep a treasure by them as a resource in time of war. They are unacquainted with the method of raising money upon extraordinary supplies, or by the creation or sale of offices,

Vol. IV. *Gen. Hist.* K k government

government securities, or annuities. The circulation of specie and public credit are things unknown amongst them, and these potentates content themselves with amassing all the gold, silver, or jewels, they possibly can. This has been the custom in the East ever since the time of Cyrus; and the vizir thought it was the same with the emperors of Germany. With this notion he carried on the siege but slowly, lest if the town was taken by storm, the soldiers would run away with the plunder. Hence it was that he never made a general assault, though there were considerable breaches in the body of the place; and the town was reduced to the last extremity. This mistake, and the effeminate behaviour of the grand vizir preserved Vienna, which was just ready to fall. He gave time to John Sobieski king of Poland to march to its relief, and to Charles V. duke of Lorraine, together with the princes of the empire, to muster up an army. The janizaries murmured; despair succeeded their indignation; and they cried out aloud, "Come on, infidels, as soon as we see your hats, we'll be sure to run away."

Accordingly, as soon as the king of Poland, and the duke of Lorraine, marched down from the mountain of Sept. 12, 1683 Calemberg, the Turks fled precipitately without fighting. Cara Mustapha, who had flattered himself with the hopes of finding immense treasure, left all his baggage and effects in the hands of Sobieski; and soon after he was strangled. Tekeli, whom this vizir had raised to the regal dignity, being suspected by the Turks of treating under hand with the emperor of Germany, 1685 many, was arrested by order of the new vizir, and sent in chains to Constantinople. The Turks lost almost the whole kingdom of Hungary.

1687 The remaining part of the reign of Mahomet IV. was famous only for unprosperous events. Morosini took the whole Peloponnesus, which was of more importance than Candia. In making this conquest, the Venetian bombs destroyed several ancient monuments which the Turks had spared, and among the rest the celebrated temple of Athens dedicated to the unknown gods. The janizaries attributing such a multitude of misfortunes

misfortunes to the indolence of the sultan, resolved to dethrone him. The caimacan, or governor of Constantinople, with Mustapha Cuprogli, superintendant of the mosque of St. Sophia, and the nakif, or keeper of Mahomet's standard, went to acquaint the sultan, that he must resign the throne, for such was the will of the whole nation. The sultan conversed with them a long time, endeavouring to justify himself. The nakif replied, that he was come to command him in the name of the people to abdicate the imperial dignity, and to resign it to his brother Solyman. Mahomet IV. made answer; "God's will be done: since his wrath must fall on my head; go tell my brother that God declares his will by the mouths of his people."

Most of our historians pretend that Mahomet IV. was murdered by the janizaries; but it appears from the Turkish annals, that he lived five years longer, confined in the seraglio. The same Mustapha Cuprogli who deposed Mahomet IV. was grand vizir under Solyman III. He recovered part of Hungary, and restored the reputation of the Turkish arms. But since that time the limits of this empire have never gone beyond Belgrade or Temeswar. The sultans preserved Candia; but they did not recover the Peloponnesus till 1715. The famous battles which prince Eugene won of the Turks, are a proof that they may be beaten, without being conquered.

Though this government be represented so arbitrary and despotic, yet it seems to have never deserved this character, except under Mahomet II. Solyman and Selim II. who made every thing bend to their will. But under most of the other emperors, and especially of late times, we shall find that the government was much the same at Constantinople, as at Algiers and Tunis. In 1703, Mustapha II. was solemnly deposed by the army and by the inhabitants of Constantinople. They did not chuse any of his children to succeed him, but his brother Achmet III. This same sultan Achmet was ordered by the janizaries and the people, in 1730, to resign the throne to his nephew Mahmoud: he obeyed

without resistance, after having sacrificed his grand vizir and his principal officers in vain, to the resentment of the nation. Are these the absolute sovereigns? People imagine that a man reigns without controul, over a great part of the globe, because he may commit some crimes with impunity in his own family, and command a few slaves to be murdered: but he cannot trample his people under foot; nay they oftener oppress him, than he them.

The manners of the Turks form an extraordinary contrast: they are fierce, and yet charitable; interested, yet hardly ever guilty of theft; indolent, without being inclined either to gaming or intemperance; very few make use of the privilege of polygamy, or of enjoying different slaves; and there is no great city in Europe, where there are so few common women as at Constantinople. Inviolably attached to their religion, they hate and despise the Christians, whom they look upon as idolaters; yet they tolerate and protect them throughout their empire, and in their capital; they permit them to make processions in the part of the town assigned them in Constantinople, and four janizaries walk before those processions.

The Turks are proud, yet they have no nobility; they are brave, though they are strangers to duelling: a virtue which they have in common with all the Asiatic nations, from their custom of never wearing arms but when they take the field. This was likewise the practice of the Greeks and Romans. The contrary usage was not introduced among Christians till the times of barbarism and chivalry, when it was made a point of duty and honour to walk on foot with boots and spurs, and to sit down to table or to pray to God with a long sword by one's side. The Christian nobility distinguished themselves by this custom; which was soon imitated, as we have already observed, by the dregs of the people, and may be ranked among those subjects of ridicule which pass unobserved, because we see them every day.

CHAP.

C H A P. CXCIIL.

Of Persia, and its Manners.—Of the last Revolution; and of Thomas Kouli-Kan, or Nadir Shah.

PERSIA was at that time more civilized than Turkey; the manners of the people were gentler; the arts were in greater esteem; and the general police was better observed. This was not merely owing to the climate; the Arabians had cultivated the arts, in this country, for the space of five centuries. It was the Arabians that built Ispahan, Chiras, Casbin, Cashan and several other great cities: on the contrary the Turks have built none, but have suffered a great many to fall to ruin. The Tartars subdued Persia twice after the reign of the Arabian Caliphs; but they did not abolish the arts: and the Sophis upon their accession to the throne, introduced the gentle manners of Armenia, where their family had been long settled. All manufactures were reckoned to be more completely finished in Persia, than in Turkey. The sciences met also with greater encouragement: there was not a city that had not several colleges for the teaching of polite literature. The Persian language more soft and harmonious than the Turkish, has produced a great number of agreeable poems. The ancient Greeks, the first preceptors of Europe, rank in the same light in regard to the Persians. Hence philosophy during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was pretty near in the same state in Persia as with us. Their astrology is the growth of their own country, and they applied themselves to it more than any people upon earth, as we have already taken notice. The custom of marking the lucky days in white, and the unlucky in black, they still most exactly observe. This was a very common practice among the Romans, who borrowed it of the Asiatic nations. Our peasants have less faith in the days fit for sowing and planting, which are mentioned in the almanacks, than the courtiers of Ispahan had in the hours favourable,

able, or unfavourable to business. The Persians were like the people of our part of the world, a sensible nation, but full of prejudices. Some travellers assure us, that this country was not so populous as it might be made. It is very probable, that at the time of the Magi it was more populous and fruitful. Agriculture was then a point of religion. Of all professions this requireth the greatest number of hands: and as it renders mankind healthy and robust, it contributes more than any other business to the procreation and maintenance of a numerous offspring.

Ispahan however, before the late revolutions, was as large and as populous as London. They reckoned above five hundred thousand inhabitants in Tauris. Cashan was compared to Lyons. It is impossible a town should be populous, if the country be not so too; unless this town subsists intirely by foreign commerce. We have but very imperfect ideas of the number of inhabitants in Turkey, Persia, and all the empires of Asia, except China: but it is beyond all doubt, that whenever a civilized nation hath great armies on foot, and numerous manufactures, it must contain a sufficient number of inhabitants.

The court of Ispahan was more magnificent than that of Constantinople. We imagine ourselves reading a relation of Xerxes's reign, when we see in the accounts of travellers, the number of horses covered with rich brocades, their harnesses glittering with gold and precious stones, and those four thousand vases of gold, mentioned by Chardin, for the use of the king of Persia's table. Common things in life, and especially eatables, were a great deal cheaper in Ispahan and Constantinople, than they are with us. Cheapness is a demonstration of plenty. Such travellers as Chardin, who are acquainted with the government of Persia, do not pretend, that all the landed estates belong to the king. They own that in this, as in every other country, there are royal demesnes with church lands, and estates of private people, possessed in full property, by right of inheritance.

Upon

Upon the whole, the accounts we have of Persia, give us reason to think, that there was no monarchy upon earth, where the people more fully enjoyed the rights of humanity. No nation in the eastern parts of the world, had such numerous resources against that bane of life, the lassitude of mind. They met in spacious coffee houses, where some were employed in sipping this liquor, which was not introduced into Europe till towards the end of the seventeenth century; others amused themselves with reading, or listening to story-tellers; while at one end of the room an ecclesiastic preached for money; and at the other, jugglers or such fellows, who live by diverting the public, exhibited their tricks. This shews them to have been a sociable nation, and we find by all accounts that they deserved to be happy. They were so, it is said, under Shah Abbas, surnamed the Great. This pretended great prince was very cruel: but there are instances of cruel persons who have been fond of order and the public good. The tyrant exercises his cruelty only upon a few individuals, who have access to his person; yet at the same time he may enact good laws, by which he promotes the general welfare of his country.

Shah-Abbas, a descendant of Ismael Sophi, became despotic, by suppressing a standing force, like that of the janizaries, or the pretorian guards. Thus it was that Peter the Great established his power by abolishing the Russian militia or strelits. The history of all countries shews us, that the dividing of troops into small bodies cements the throne; while uniting them into one compact body, tends to weaken and subvert it. Shah-Abbas transported people from one country to another; which the Turks never did. These colonies seldom succeed. Out of thirty thousand Christian families, which Shah-Abbas removed from Armenia and Georgia, to Mazanderan on the Caspian sea, there are not above four or five hundred left. But he erected public edifices, rebuilt towns, and made useful foundations. He recovered the provinces which Solyman and Selim had taken from the Persians; and he drove the Portuguese from Ormus.

Ormus. By these exploits he obtained the title of Great; and died in 1629. His son Shah-Sophi, more cruel, but less the soldier and politician than his father, gave himself up to debauch; and his reign was unfortunate. Shah-Gean, the great Mogul, wrested Candahar from Persia, and the Sultan Amurath IV. took Bagdat by storm in 1638.

Ever since that time the Persian monarchy has been upon the decline, till at length the voluptuousness of the dynasty of the Sophis entirely ruined it. The eunuchs governed the seraglio and the empire, under Muza-Sophi, and Shah-Hussein, the last of this family.

It is the utmost disgrace to human nature, and the scandal of the East, to deprive men of their virility; *manhood* but to entrust the government to the hands of those wretches, is the last stretch of despotism. Wherever their power has been excessive, impotency and ruin have ensued. The weakness of Shah-Hussein had so enervated the empire, and the factions of the black and white eunuchs had occasioned such violent disturbances, that if Myriweis and his Afghans had not destroyed this family, it would have perished of itself. It is the fate of Persia that all her dynasties begin with force, and end in weakness. Almost all the different races of their sovereigns have had the fate of Sardan-Pull, whom we call Sardanapalus.

Those Afghans, who subverted the Persian throne at the beginning of the present century, were an ancient colony of Tartars, inhabiting the mountains of Candahar, between India and Persia. Almost all the revolutions that have changed the face of those countries, have been owing to the Tartars. The Persians had recovered Candahar from the Mogul towards the year 1650, under Shah-Abbas II. and this was their misfortune. The ministry under Shah-Hussein, grandson of Shah-Abbas II. used the Afghans ill: upon which Myriweis, who was only a private person, but of a daring spirit, undertook to be their leader.

This is one of those revolutions, in which the character of the people had a greater share than that of their

the
ano
nep
arm
no l
prog
cipl
our
sein
prov
prov
foll
to I
vere
and
self
marr
A
have
there
the r
never
pal f
what
what
durin
hath
gree
Re
The
Persia
Afgha
the m
1725,
new u
Afraf.
The T
chis.
the we
bent in
VOL

their chiefs: for Myriweis having been assassinated by another barbarian named Maghmud, who was his own nephew; and who took upon him the command of the army, when he was but eighteen years of age, there was no likelihood that this young man could make any great progress of himself, or that he could lead those undisciplined and wild mountaineers, in the same manner as our European generals conduct regular armies. Hussein's government was grown contemptible, and the province of Candahar having begun the troubles, the provinces of mount Caucasus on the side of Georgia followed the example. At length Maghmud laid siege to Ispahan in 1722. Upon which Shah-Hussein delivered up his capital to him, laid his crown at his feet, and acknowledged him for his sovereign, thinking himself very happy that Maghmud would vouchsafe to marry his daughter.

Among all the scenes of cruelty and misery that we have been viewing since the time of Charlemagne, there is none more shocking than that which followed the revolution of Ispahan. Maghmud thought he could never secure the throne, but by massacring the principal families. Persia has been for these thirty years what Germany was before the peace of Westphalia, what France was at the time of Charles V. or England during the wars of the white and red roses. But Persia hath fallen from a more flourishing state to a lower degree of misery.

Religion had a share likewise in this devastation. The Afghans followed the doctrine of Omar, and the Persians that of Ali. This Maghmud, chief of the Afghans, mixed the most ridiculous superstition with the most detestable cruelty. He died raving mad in 1725, after laying Persia waste. To him succeeded a new usurper of the Afghan nation, whose name was Asraf. The misery of Persia increased on every side. The Turks poured in from Georgia, the ancient Colchis. The Russians fell upon the northern provinces to the west of the Caspian sea, towards the gates of Derbent in Shirvan, the ancient Iberia and Albania. Amidst

these commotions, they do not tell us what became of the dethroned king Shah-Hussein. This prince is known only by the epocha of his country's ruin.

One of this emperor's sons, named Thamas, having escaped the massacre of the Imperial family, was followed by some faithful subjects, who flocked about his person in the neighbourhood of Tauris. Civil wars and national calamities have usually been productive of extraordinary men, who would never perhaps have been heard of in peaceable times. A shepherd's son became the protector of prince Thamas, and the support of a throne which he afterwards usurped. This man, who ranks among the greatest conquerors, was named Nadir. He kept his father's sheep in the plains of Khorassan, part of the ancient Hyrcania and Bactriana. We must not imagine those shepherds to be like ours. The pastoral life, which still subsists in many parts of Asia, is not inconsistent with wealth; the tents of those rich shepherds are far more valuable than the houses of our farmers. Nadir sold several of his father's flocks, and put himself at the head of a gang of banditti, a practice very common in those parts, where the people have preserved the manners of antiquity. He surrendered himself and his men to prince Thamas; and by his ambition, courage, and activity, he rose to have the command of the army. He then took the name of *Thamas Kouli-Kan*; *the kan, slave to Thamas*. But the slave was master under a weak voluptuous prince, like his father Hussein. He recovered Ispahan and all Persia, pursued the new king Asraf as far as
1729 Candahar, where he defeated his army, took him prisoner, and ordered him to be beheaded after plucking out his eyes.

Kouli-Kan having thus restored prince Thamas to the throne of his ancestors, resolved to prevent his being ungrateful. He confined him in the capital of Khorassan; and being fully sensible, that he could never preserve his power but by the same means, by which it was acquired, he turned his arms against the Turks. He defeated them at Erivan, recovered all that country, and secured

secured his conquests by making peace with the Russians. Then it was that he caused himself to be declared king of Persia, by the name of Nadir Shah. He did not forget the ancient custom of pulling out the eyes of those who have a right to the throne. This cruelty he practised upon his own sovereign Thamas. The same armies which had helped to lay Persia waste, contributed also to render him formidable to his neighbours. He gained several victories over the Turks; with whom at length he concluded an honourable peace, by which they restored all that they had ever taken from Persia, except Bagdat and its territory.

Kouli-Kan loaded with crimes and with glory, marched afterwards to the conquest of India, as we shall see in the following chapter. At his return to Persia, he found a party formed in favour of the surviving princes of the royal family; and in the midst of those commotions he was assassinated by his own nephew, like Myriweis the first author of the revolution. Persia then became once more the seat of civil war. Such a series of devastations hath put a stop to commerce and the arts, by destroying part of the inhabitants; but where the soil is fruitful, and the people industrious, the country will recover itself in time.

C H A P. CXCIV.

Of the M O G U L.

IT is this prodigious variety of manners, customs, laws, and revolutions, all derived from the same principle of interest, that constitutes the historical map of the universe. We have seen no rebellion of son against father, either in Persia or Turkey. But in India we find the two sons of the great Mogul at war with him successively, in the beginning of the seventeenth century. One of those princes, named Shah-Gean, took possession of the imperial crown in 1627, upon the

death of his father Gean-Guir, in prejudice to a grandson, to whom Gean-Guir had bequeathed the throne. The order of succession was not an established law in Asia, as among the European nations. Hence, those people had one source of misery more than we.

Shah-Gean, who had rebelled against his father, lived to see his own sons follow his example. It is difficult to comprehend how sovereigns, who could not hinder their own children from taking up arms, should be so absolute as some would make us believe. India seems to have been nearly under the same kind of government, as that of the European kingdoms at the time of the feudal tenures. The governors of the provinces of Indostan were absolute in their several districts; and viceroys were conferred on the emperor's sons. This, without doubt, was a perpetual source of civil war; so that as soon as the health of the emperor Shah-Gean began to decline, his four sons, each of whom had the command of a province, took up arms to dispute the succession. They agreed to dethrone their father, and afterwards went to war with one another: this was exactly the case of Louis the Weak, or the Debonnair. Aurengzeb, the most wicked of the four brothers, proved the most fortunate.

The same hypocrisy as that which we observed in Cromwell, the same dissimulation and cruelty, with a more unnatural disposition, formed the characteristic of this prince. He entered into a conspiracy at first with one of his brothers, and made himself master of his father's person, whom he kept close confined: the next thing he did was to murder that same brother, whom he had made use of as a tool, though now he thought him too dangerous to live: then he fell upon his other two brothers, whom he overpowered, and strangled successively in prison.

Yet Aurengzeb's father was still living; though detained by his son in close confinement. The name of the old emperor having served often as a pretext to conspiracies, the tyrant sent a physician to him at a time when he
1666 was slightly indisposed, and the old man died. It was
believed

believed all over Asia that Aurengzeb had poisoned his father. Never was there a stronger instance, that happiness is not the reward of virtue. Though stained with the blood of his brothers, and guilty of the murder of his father, Aurengzeb succeeded in all his undertakings. He did not die till 1707, aged about a hundred and three. Never had prince so long a series of prosperities. He increased the empire of the moguls with the kingdoms of Visapour and Golconda, with the whole country of Carnate, and almost the intire peninsula terminated by the coast of Coromandel and Malabar. This man, who would have died by the hands of an executioner, could he have been tried by the customary laws of nations, was, beyond all dispute, the most potent prince in the universe. The magnificence of the kings of Persia, as dazzling as it has appeared to our eyes, was but a trifle, when compared to the riches of Aurengzeb.

The Asiatic princes have in all ages been remarkable for treasures; these consist of their own hoards; but the European princes are rich with the money that circulates among their subjects. Tamerlane's treasure was still preserved, and his successors had added to the heap. The increase under Aurengzeb was immense: one of his thrones only was estimated by Tavernier at a hundred and sixty millions of livres in his time, which is above three hundred at present. Twelve columns of massy gold, which supported the canopy of the throne, were covered with large pearls: the canopy was also of pearls and diamonds, mounted by a peacock with a tail of precious stones: every thing else was proportioned to this astonishing magnificence. The greatest solemnity in the year was when the emperor used to be weighed in golden scales, before all the people; on which occasion he constantly received above fifty millions of livres in presents.

If there be any such thing as influence of climate, it is surely in India; the mogul emperors introduced the same luxury, and lived in the same voluptuousness and ease, as the Indian kings mentioned by Quintus Curtius:

tius: the Tartar conquerors insensibly fell into the same manners, and became Indians.

This excessive opulence and luxury has but contributed to the miseries of India. The same thing happened in 1739, to the grandson of Aurengzeb, Mahamad-Shah, as to Croesus. This king of Lydia had been told, "You have a great quantity of gold; but he that will make a better use of iron than you, will strip you of it all."

Thamas Kouli-Kan, having raised himself to the throne of Persia, after dethroning his master, conquering the Afghans, and taking Candahar, marched to the capital of India, in order to strip the mogul of those treasures, of which he had robbed his subjects. There is hardly an instance in history of a more numerous army than that which the great mogul Mahamad raised against Thamas Kouli-Kan; nor of a weaker defence. He had twelve hundred thousand men, ten thousand pieces of cannon, and two thousand elephants armed for war, to oppose the conqueror of Persia, who had only sixty thousand combatants. Darius did not march such large armies against Alexander.

We are likewise told, that this multitude of Indians were covered by intrenchments of six leagues in extent, where they expected to be attacked by Thamas Kouli-Kan. This was being sensible of their weakness. So immense an army ought to have surrounded the enemy, to have cut off their communication, and starved them out in a strange country. So far from that, it was the little army that besieged the great one, that cut off their provisions, and that destroyed them in detail. It seemed as if the great mogul Mahamad came only to expose his vanity, and to yield homage to a gang of disciplined banditti. He made his submission in the presence of Thamas Kouli-Kan, who spoke to him in the tone of a sovereign. The conqueror marched to Deli, a city said to be larger and more populous than Paris or London. He dragged this rich and miserable emperor in his train; and, after confining him to a
tower,

tower, caused himself to be proclaimed emperor of India.

Some of the mogul's officers had seized on the opportunity of a night, when the Persians were indulging themselves in debauch, to take up arms against their conquerors. In revenge Thamas Kouli-Kan delivered up the town to be pillaged and destroyed. He carried away more treasures from Deli, than the Spaniards took at the conquest of Mexico. This treasure, having been hoarded by plunderers during four centuries, was conveyed into Persia by another plunderer: yet the Persians have reaped no benefit from it, but have been long the most wretched people upon the face of the earth: the treasure has been dispersed, or lies buried during the civil wars; perhaps some tyrant will dig it up again.

Kouli-Kan, setting out from India upon his return to Persia, had the vanity to leave the name of emperor to this Mahamad Shah whom he had dethroned: but he committed the government to a viceroy, who had educated the grand mogul, and who afterwards rendered himself independent. He detached three kingdoms from this vast empire; Cachemire, Caboul, and Multan, to be incorporated with Persia; and he imposed a tribute of some millions on Indostan.

This country was at that time governed by a viceroy and council of Thamas Kouli-Kan's appointing. The grandson of Aurengzeb retained the title of king of kings, and sovereign of the world, while in fact he was no more than a phantom. But every thing reverted to its natural order, after Kouli-Kan was murdered in Persia, in the midst of his triumphs: the mogul ceased to pay tribute; and the provinces, wrested by the Persian conqueror, were restored to the empire.

We are not to imagine that this Mahamad, king of kings, was despotic before his misfortunes: Aurengzeb, it is true, had been such, but it was by his excessive vigilance, by his victories, and by his cruelties. Despotism is a violent state, which does not seem to have any durability. It is impossible that in an empire
in

in which the viceroys have armies of twenty thousand men, they should long submit to arbitrary power. The lands which the emperor bestows on those viceroys, are by that very act independent of him. Let us not therefore imagine, that in India the product of every man's labour belongs only to the sovereign. Several Indian tribes have preserved their ancient possessions. The other lands have been given to the grandees of the empire, to the rajahs, nabobs, and omrahs. Those lands are cultivated, as in other places, by wealthy farmers, and not by slaves that work only for their masters. The common people are poor in the opulent country of India, as they are generally in all parts of the globe: but they are not slaves, or annexed to the glebe, as they were formerly in our part of Europe, and as they are still in Poland, Bohemia, and several provinces of Germany. The peasant throughout Asia may quit his country when he is dissatisfied, and go in search of a better, if it is to be found.

We may observe of India in general, that it is governed like a conquered country, by thirty tyrants, who acknowledge an emperor sunk, like themselves, into effeminacy and ease, and who devour the substance of the people. In that country there are none of those great courts, the permanent depositaries of laws, which protect the weak against the strong.

It is a problem which at first sight appears difficult to solve, that the gold and silver imported from America into Europe, should be continually swallowed up in India, never to return; and yet that the common people should be so poor as to work almost for nothing. But the reason is, this money does not go among the common people, but among the merchants; these pay immense duties to the governors, who give great part of it to the grand Mogul, and embezzle the rest. The price of labour is less in India, though the richest country upon earth, than any where else; because into whatever part of the world you go, you will find that a labourer's daily hire seldom exceeds his food and rayment. Now it is owing to the extreme fertility of the
soil,

soil,
rayn
who
buy
the
I
idola
stition
mins
selve
the c
and
make
death
Tave
one
bram
under
accou
his m
starve
and s
On
scarce
been
marry
father
been
In
poor p
reckon
eunuc
immer
When
thousa
priest,
presen
them
inured
extraor
VOL

soil, and the heat of the climate, that this food and rayment are so vastly cheap in India. The labourer who digs for diamonds in the mines, earns enough to buy a little rice and a cotton shirt. The poor all over the world sell their service for a trifle to the rich.

I shall not repeat what hath been already said of the idolaters, who are very numerous in India: their superstitions are the same as in Alexander's time; the brahmins teach the same religion; the women throw themselves upon the funeral piles, which are lighted to burn the dead bodies of their husbands; of this our travellers and our merchants, have seen many instances. Some make it a point of honour to kill themselves upon the death of those of whom they have received instruction. Tavernier relates, that he was witness himself in Agra, one of the chief cities in India, when the principal brahmin happening to die, a merchant, who had studied under him, came to the Dutch factory, to settle his accounts, and told them, that he was resolved to follow his master to the other world; and accordingly he starved himself to death, in spite of all they could do and say, to persuade him to live.

One thing worthy of observation is, that the arts scarce ever depart from families where once they have been cultivated. The daughter of an artisan will never marry an husband who is not of the same trade as her father; this is a very ancient custom in Asia, and had been heretofore a law in Egypt.

In Asia and Africa, polygamy is not a privilege that poor people can always make use of; the rich have ever reckoned women a part of their property, and taken eunuchs to watch them; this custom has obtained time immemorial in India, and indeed throughout Asia. When the Jews wanted to have a king, above three thousand years ago, Samuel, their magistrate and high-priest, who opposed the establishment of royalty, represented to the nation that a king would levy taxes on them to pay his eunuchs. Mankind must have been inured to servitude, when such a custom did not appear extraordinary.

VOL. IV. *Gen. Hist.*

M m

While

Figure of a Slave *in Asia*

While we were finishing this chapter, a new revolution has subverted the government of India. The tributary princes, or the viceroys, have all thrown off the yoke. The people of the inland parts have dethroned the sovereign. India is now like Persia, the theatre of civil war. These calamities are a proof that the government was very bad, and, at the same time, that this pretended despotism is a chimera. The emperor had not power sufficient to enforce obedience from a single raja.

Travellers imagine that the great mogul is essentially invested with arbitrary power, because Aurengzeb made every thing yield to his will. But they did not consider, that this power, being intirely founded on force, lasts no longer than a prince is at the head of an army; and that this despotism, which destroys every thing, at length destroys itself. It is not a form of government, but a subversion of all government: it admits of caprice as the only rule: it does not rely upon laws to secure its duration: therefore the colossus tumbles down to the ground, when it ceases to lift up its arm: several petty tyrants arise out of its ruins; and the state does not resume a settled form till it is governed by laws.

C H A P. CXC.V.

Of China in the Seventeenth Century; and at the Beginning of the Eighteenth.

IT will certainly be of no use to you to know that in the Chinese dynasty, subsequent to that of the Tartars of Genghis-kan, the emperor *Quancum* succeeded *Kincum*, and *Kicum* succeeded *Quancum*. It is proper these names should be in chronological tables; but, you, who direct your attention chiefly to events and manners, are desirous of passing over these empty spaces, in order to get at times that are signalized by great transactions. The same effeminacy which ruined Persia

Persia and India, produced a revolution in China in the last century, more complete than that of Genghis-kan and his grandsons. The Chinese empire was much happier at the beginning of the seventeenth century, than India, Persia, or Turkey. Mankind cannot possibly frame a better government than where every thing is decided by great tribunals, subordinate to each other, the members of which are not admitted till after severe examination. Every thing is determined by these tribunals. Six sovereign courts direct all the rest of the empire. The first watches over the mandarins of the provinces; the second directs the finances; the third has the superintendence of religious rites, sciences, and arts; the fourth has the management of war; the fifth presides over the courts of judicature; the sixth takes care of all public works. The result of the several decisions is carried to a supreme tribunal. Under these there are forty-four subaltern courts, that reside at Pekin. Each mandarin in his province, or town, is assisted by a tribunal. In such a government, it is impossible the emperor should exercise any arbitrary power. The general laws flow from him: but, according to the constitution, he can do nothing without taking previous advice of persons educated in the study of the laws, who are elected by votes. And though they may prostrate themselves before the emperor as before a god; though the least disrespect to his person may be punished as a sacrilege, yet this is no proof of a despotic government. A despotic government would be that, wherein the prince might, consistently with law, strip a private citizen of his property, or life, without form of justice, or any other reason than his will. Now, if ever there was a government, where the life, honour, and estate of the subject are secured, it is that of China. The more numerous the depositaries of the law, the less arbitrary is the administration; and if the sovereign sometimes abuseth his power against the few who venture to come near him, he cannot abuse it against the multitude who know him not, and who live under the protection of the laws.

Their improvement of agriculture, which far exceeds any thing we have seen in Europe, is a demonstration that the people do not groan under those taxes, which lye so heavy on the husbandman; and the great number of persons employed in diverting the public, shews that the towns were as flourishing, as the country was fruitful. In every city throughout the empire, public spectacles were exhibited on festivals. They did not go to the play houses, they made the players come to them; they delighted in theatrical entertainments, without being perfect in the drama: for the Chinese have perfected no polite art or science, except morality: but their enjoyments were proportioned to their knowledge: in short, they were happy, as far as human nature is capable of happiness.

To this desirable state, about the year 1630, succeeded a most terrible catastrophe, or general desolation. The family of the Tartar princes, descendants of Genghis-kan, followed the example of all conquerors; they weakened the conquering nation, to the end that their successors might have no occasion to fear another revolution on the conquered throne. This dynasty of Ivan having been at length dispossessed by that of Ming, the Tartars north of the great wall were looked upon as savages, from whom there was nothing either to expect or to fear. Beyond the great wall is the kingdom of Leaotong, which was incorporated by the family of Genghis-kan with the empire of China, and is now become entirely Chinese. To the north-east of Leaotong, were some hords of Mantchou Tartars, whom the viceroy of Leaotong treated with severity. They made bold remonstrances, such as the Scythians are said in all times to have made since the invasion of Cyrus; for the spirit of a people is ever the same, unless it be subdued by long oppression. All the answer the governor returned, was to burn their cottages, to carry off their flocks, and to order their inhabitants to be transplanted. Upon which, those Tartars, who were free, elected a chief to lead them to war. This chief, whose name was Taitso, soon rose to be king; he beat the

the Chinese, entered victorious into Leaotong, and 1622 took the city by storm.

This war was conducted like those of the most distant times. The use of fire arms was unknown in that part of the world. The ancient arms, as the bow, the spear, the club, the scimitar, were those in use: they had but very little knowledge of shields and helmets, much less of metal brassets and buskins. Their fortifications consisted of a ditch, a wall, and towers: their way was either to undermine, or scale the wall. Strength of body was what determined the victory: and the Tartars, accustomed to lie in the open fields, must naturally have had the advantage over a people used to a more delicate life.

Taitsou, the first chief of the Tartar hords happening to die in 1626, at the beginning of his conquests; his son Taitsong immediately assumed the title of emperor of the Tartars, and put himself upon a level with the emperor of China. It is said that he knew how to read and write: it appears moreover that, like the Chinese literati, he acknowledged but one God; whom he called *Tien* as they did. He expresses himself thus, in a circular letter to the magistrates of the Chinese provinces, "Tien raiseth whomsoever he pleaseth; perhaps he hath chosen me for your master." And indeed, from the year 1628, *Tien* crowned him constantly with victory. Taitsong was a very able prince; he civilized his people in order to teach them obedience, and he established laws in the midst of war. He was always at the head of his troops; while the emperor of China, named Hoaitfang, but who is almost forgotten, remained in his palace with his women and eunuchs. This was the last emperor of the Chinese race; he could not hinder Taitsong and the Tartars from stripping him of his northern provinces; nor a rebel mandarin, whose name was Litching, from usurping those to the south. While the Tartars were ravaging the eastern and northern parts of China, this Litching made himself master of all the rest. It is pretended that he had six hundred thousand horse, and four hundred thousand foot. He appeared with the flower of his troops before
the

the gates of Pekin: but the emperor never stirred out of his palace; he was ever ignorant of what was transacting. Listching the rebel (so he is called, because he did not succeed) sent back to the emperor two of his chief eunuchs, whom he had taken prisoners, with a very concise letter, advising him to abdicate the throne.

Here we may perceive the nature of Asiatic pride, and how consistent it is with effeminacy. The emperor ordered the two eunuchs to be beheaded, for bringing him so disrespectful a letter. They had a good deal of difficulty to make him sensible that the princes of the blood, and a multitude of mandarins whom Listching had in his power, must answer with their heads for those of the two eunuchs.

While the emperor was debating what answer to give, Listching entered Pekin. The empress had just time to send away some of her sons; then she locked the chamber-door, and hanged herself. The emperor flew thither immediately, and greatly approving this mark of fidelity, he exhorted forty more of his wives to follow the example. Father Mailla the Jesuit, who wrote an account of these transactions at Pekin, in the last century, pretends that all those women obeyed without the least reply; but perhaps some of them required assistance. The emperor, whom he represents as a very good natured prince, happened to see, after this execution, his only daughter, who was but fifteen years of age, and whom the empress had not thought proper to send out of the palace: he exhorted her to hang herself after the example of her mother and her mothers-in-law; but the princess not chusing to comply, this good natured prince, as Mailla calls him, gave her a terrible cut with his sabre, which laid her prostrate. One would expect that such a father, and such a husband, would instantly kill himself upon the dead bodies of his wives and his daughter; but he retired to a pavilion out of town, there to wait for the event: hearing at length that all was lost, and that Listching had taken possession of his palace, he strangled himself, thus putting an end to his empire, and to a life which

he had not courage to defend. This extraordinary event happened in the year 1641. It was in the reign of this last emperor of the Chinese race, that the Jesuits at length insinuated themselves into the court of Peking. Father Adam Schall, a native of Cologne, had ingratiated himself so far with this emperor by his knowledge in natural philosophy and the mathematics, that he was made a mandarin. He was the first that cast brass cannon in China; but the few pieces they had at Peking, and which they knew not how to use, did not save the empire. Schall the mandarin left Peking before the revolution.

After the emperor's decease, the Tartars and rebels disputed who should be masters of China. The Tartars were united and trained up to war; the Chinese divided and undisciplined. By degrees the latter were obliged to give way to the former, who had acquired a superiority independent of the conduct of their leader. It was with them as with Mahomet's Arabians, who were so formidable of themselves for above three hundred years.

The death of the emperor Taitsong, whom the Tartars lost at that same time, did not hinder them from pursuing their conquests. They chose one of his nephews, who was yet an infant: this was Changti father of the celebrated Cam-hi, under whom the Christian religion made some progress in China. These people, who had taken up arms to defend their liberties, had no notion of hereditary right. We find that all nations began with electing chiefs to lead them to battle; and those chiefs in time grew to be absolute, except in a few parts of Europe. Thus hereditary right was established, and in process of time became sacred.

A minority generally proves fatal to conquerors; yet it was under this minority of Changti that the Tartars completed the reduction of China. The rebel Litching was slain by another Chinese usurper, who pretended to avenge the death of the emperor Honitfang. In several provinces they proclaimed the real or pretended sons of the last prince, who had been dethroned and

and strangled ; just as they set up the different Demetrius's in Russia. Some of the Chinese mandarins endeavoured to usurp a few provinces ; but the great Tartar usurpers got the better at length of all the small ones. A Chinese general for some time retarded their progress, because he had a few cannon, either from the Portuguese of Macao, or cast by Schall the Jesuit. It is very extraordinary that the Tartars, only with bows and arrows, should prevail against those who had artillery to defend them : this was the reverse of what happened in America, and shews the superior genius of northern over southern nations.

What is more surprizing is, that the Tartars should conquer this vast empire, step by step, under two minorities ; for their young emperor Changti happening to die in 1661 in his 24th year, before this empire was thoroughly settled, they chose his son Cam-hi, an infant eight years old, the age at which his father had been chosen. This Cam-hi established the Chinese empire, by his great prudence, and was so fortunate as to be equally respected both by the Tartars and the Chinese. The missionaries, whom he raised to the dignity of mandarins, commend him as the model of a perfect prince. Some travellers, and especially Le Gentil, who were not mandarins, say that he was not only sordid and avaricious, but extremely whimsical : these personal reflexions however do not belong to this general view of the world ; it is sufficient that the empire was happy under this prince ; and this is the criterion by which we are to judge of kings.

During this revolution, which lasted above thirty years, one of the greatest mortifications the Chinese underwent, was that their conquerors obliged them to cut off their hair, after the manner of the Tartars. There were some who preferred death to this compliance. We have seen insurrections in Muscovy, when Peter the Great obliged his subjects to cut off their beards ; such is the power of custom over the vulgar.

Time hath not yet confounded the conquerors with the conquered ; as in France, England, and other countries.

cou
cush
wi
I
fion
lodg
and
instr
by t
jeal
that
ever
the
T
coul
to te
othe
Rom
decid
own
fiona
T
were
banc
supp
the
were
of the
from
silenc
was Y
which
Letter
" V
" bor
" you
* Se
of Loui
† Se
Vor

countries. But the Tartars having adopted the laws, customs and religion of the Chinese, the two nations will soon form only one.

During the reign of this Cam-hi, the European missionaries enjoyed great privileges: many of them were lodged in the imperial palace; they built churches, and had rich houses. They succeeded in America by instructing savages in the necessary arts, and in China by teaching a sensible people the sublimer studies. But jealousy soon destroyed the fruit of their wisdom; and that spirit of inquietude and contention, which is ever the concomitant of knowledge and abilities among the Europeans, defeated their noblest designs.

The Chinese were surprized to see foreign sages, who could not agree even in regard to what they were come to teach, who persecuted and anathematized one another, who had entered into mutual prosecutions at Rome *, and who made a congregation of cardinals decide, whether the emperor of China understood his own language as well as the Italian and French missionaries.

These disputes were caried so high, that the Chinese were afraid, or pretended to be afraid, of the same disturbances as had happened in Japan †. Cam-hi's successor suppressed the exercise of the Christian religion; while the Mahometans, and the different sorts of bonzes were tolerated. But this same court being as sensible of the want of mathematics, as of the pretended danger from a new religion, kept the mathematicians, and silenced the missionaries. The emperor, whose name was Yont-ching, addressed them in the following words, which they have had the honesty to relate in their *Letters Curious and Edifying*:

“What would you say, if I was to send a number of bonzes and lamas into your country? How would you receive them? Although you found means to

* See the chapter of *Chinese Ceremonies*, at the end of *The Age of Louis XIV.* V.

† See the following chapter of *Japan.* V.

"impose upon my father, do not think I will suffer
 "you to deceive me in the same manner. You would
 "have the Chinese embrace your religion; now I very
 "well know, that you will not allow of any worship
 "different from your own: what then must become of
 "me and my people? Shall we not be the subjects of
 "your princes, since the proselytes you make acknow-
 "ledge no other authority than yours? In times of
 "trouble and distraction they would listen only to you.
 "I am sensible that at present we have nothing to fear;
 "but when your vassals shall find the way hither by
 "thousands, times of trouble and distraction may
 "ensue."

The very Jesuits, who give us an account of this
 speech, acknowledge, with every other writer, that this
 emperor was one of the wisest and most generous
 princes that ever filled a throne. His whole study was
 to relieve the necessities of the poor, and oblige them
 to work; to enforce the observance of the laws, by
 setting the example himself; to check the ambition and
 the intrigues of the bonzes; to maintain peace and
 plenty throughout his empire; and to cultivate and
 encourage all the useful arts, especially agriculture.
 During his reign the public edifices, the high roads,
 and the canals, which form a communication between
 all the principal rivers of this extensive empire, were
 supported with a magnificence and œconomy, of which
 there has been no instance, but among the ancient
 Romans.

A memorable event in this empire, was the great
 earthquake in 1699, under the emperor Cam-hi; a
 phenomenon more fatal than that which overturned
 Lima and Lisbon in our days: about four hundred
 thousand people are said to have been destroyed. These
 concussions have often happened to our globe. From
 the number of volcanos that vomit smoke and fire, one
 would think that the outward shell of the earth rests on
 vast caverns, and that it is full of inflammable matter.
 In all probability this globe of ours hath undergone as

many

many physical revolutions, as avarice and ambition hath occasioned moral ones among mankind.

C H A P. CXCVI.

Of Japan in the seventeenth Century, and of the Suppression of the Christian Religion in that Country.

AMIDST the multitude of revolutions which we have beheld from one extremity of the earth to the other, there seems to be a fatal concatenation of causes, that impel mankind just as the winds impel the sands and waves of the sea. This is farther confirmed by what passed in Japan. In the fifteenth century a Portuguese prince, neither famed for power, nor riches, took it into his head to send a few ships to the coasts of Africa. Soon after the Portuguese discovered Japan, The Spaniards having for a time obtained the sovereignty of Portugal, carried on an immense trade with that empire. Under this sanction, and in consequence of the general toleration of sects in Asia, the Christian religion was established in that country. Three Japanese princes went to Rome to kiss the feet of Pope Gregory XIII. Christianity was like to be the predominant, and even the only religion of Japan, when its own force helped to destroy it. We have already taken notice that the missionaries had a great many enemies in that country; but they had likewise a very strong party in their favour. The bonzes were afraid for their ancient possessions, and the emperor was afraid for the state. The Spaniards had made themselves masters of the Philippine islands bordering upon Japan. What they had done in America was known to all the world; therefore it is not at all surprizing that this nation should be alarmed. So early as the year 1586, the emperor of Japan proscribed the Christian religion; and his subjects were forbid the exercise thereof upon pain of death: but as the trade with the Spaniards and the

the Portuguese was still open, their missionaries gained profelytes as fast as the government made martyrs. Foreign merchants were forbid to bring any Christian priests into the country : notwithstanding this prohibition the governor of the Philippine islands sent some Franciscan monks upon an embassy to the emperor of Japan. These ambassadors began with building a public chapel in Meaco, the capital of the empire ; but they were driven from thence, and the persecution increased. Cruelty and indulgence were shewn alternately for a long time. It is evident that reasons of state were the only cause of those persecutions ; and that what determined the government to declare against the Christian religion, was the apprehension of its being rendered subservient to the ambitious designs of the Spaniards. For never did the Japanese persecute the religion of Confucius, though introduced by a people of whom they are jealous, and against whom they have often made war.

That learned and judicious observer, Kempfer, who was so long upon the spot, tells us, that in 1674, they took a list of the inhabitants of Meaco ; and it was found that there were twelve religions in this capital, that the inhabitants all lived very quietly, and were reckoned about four hundred thousand souls, without including the numerous court of the supreme pontiff, the Dairi. It is plain that had the Portuguese and Spaniards been satisfied with liberty of conscience, they might have lived as peaceably in Japan as the people of those twelve religions. They still carried on a most lucrative commerce in this empire in 1636, since we are told by Kempfer, that their imports into Meaco, amounted to two thousand three hundred and fifty chests of silver.

The Dutch, who traded to Japan since the year 1600, were jealous of the Spanish commerce. In 1637, they took a vessel of this nation near the Cape of Good Hope, upon its return from Japan to Lisbon : on board this ship they found some letters from a Portuguese officer named Moro, a kind of consul from that nation, containing

containing the project of a conspiracy of the Christians in Japan against the emperor; mentioning moreover the number of ships and soldiers they expected from Europe, and from the settlements in Asia, to execute the project. The letters were sent to the court of Japan; Moro acknowledged his hand writing, and was publicly burnt.

Upon this, the government chose rather to forego all commerce with foreigners, than to be exposed any longer to the like danger. The emperor Jemits, at an assembly of the grandees, published a famous edict, that no Japanese should be permitted to leave the kingdom upon pain of death, that no foreigner should be admitted into the empire, that the Spaniards and Portuguese should be expelled, that all the Christians in the country should be imprisoned, and a reward of near a thousand crowns be given to any body that would discover a Christian priest. This violent resolution to separate themselves at once from the rest of the world, and for ever to renounce the advantages of commerce, leaves no room to question but the conspiracy was real: and what puts it beyond all manner of doubt, is, that the Christians of the country, with a few Portuguese at their head, did really rise up in arms to the number of about thirty thousand; but they were defeated in 1638, and retired to a fortress upon the sea-coast, near the port of Nangasaki.

In the mean time all foreigners were expelled; even the Chinese were comprehended under this general law, because some Christians had boasted in Japan, that China was upon the point of being converted to Christianity. The Dutch themselves, who had detected the conspiracy, was driven away like the rest: the government had begun to demolish their counting-house at Firando; and their ships were already sailed from that port: but there was one yet left behind, the captain of which was ordered by the government to cannonade the fortress, where the Christians had taken shelter. The Dutch captain, whose name was Kokbeker, did this fatal service; the Christians were soon forced to surrender, and
to

to undergo the most cruel punishments. Once more I repeat it, when we reflect on such strange revolutions in Japan, occasioned by a Portuguese consul of the name of Moro, and by a Dutch captain, whose name was Kokbeker, we rest fully convinced of the restless spirit of Europeans, and of that fatality which disposeth of nations.

Notwithstanding the abominable service which the Dutch had done to Japan, yet they did not obtain the expected favour, of establishing a free trade: however they were permitted to land upon a little island called Desima, in the neighbourhood of Nangasaki, and there to unload a certain quantity of merchandizes.

Previous to their being admitted into this little island, which may be considered in some measure as a prison, they are obliged to trample upon the cross, to renounce all marks of Christianity, and to swear that they are not of the Portuguese religion. As soon as they arrive, their ships are seized on, and a price is fixed on their merchandize. Every year they subject themselves to this restraint for the love of money; and they, who are kings at Batavia and the Moluccas, suffer themselves to be treated here as slaves. It is true they are conducted from the little island to the emperor's court, and upon the road they meet with respect and civility: but all the time they are observed with a most careful eye, and their conductors or guards take an oath signed with their blood, that they will watch every step of the Dutch, and give an exact account to the government.

It has been asserted in several books, that the Dutch do abjure Christianity in Japan: this opinion is founded on the adventure of a Dutchman, who having escaped the vigilance of the guards, went to live among the natives of the country, but was soon detected; to save his life he said he was not a Christian, but a Dutchman. The Japanese government ever since that time have forbid the building of any ships, fit to go out to sea. They will have none but long boats, for the commerce of their islands. To have any communication with

foreigners

foreigners is reckoned the highest of crimes; one would think they are still afraid, even after the danger is over. This terror is neither reconcilable to the courage of the people, nor to the grandeur of the empire: but they seem to have proceeded to this extremity, more from the horror of past treachery, than from the apprehension of future danger. The whole conduct of the Japanese shews them to be a people generous and easy in their temper, but bold and desperate in their resolutions; at first they gave a cordial reception to strangers, and when they perceived themselves injured and betrayed, they broke of all foreign connexion for ever.

When Colbert, that minister of immortal memory, first erected an East-India Company in France, he wanted to try if he could not bring about a trade for the French to Japan, by employing only those who might swear that they were not of the same religion as the Portuguese: but the Dutch opposed this design; and the Japanese, content to receive every year one nation whom they treat as prisoners, would not admit of two.

I shall say nothing here of the kingdom of Siam, which has been represented to us as much larger and more opulent than it really is. You will find in the Age of Louis XIV. what little is necessary to be known concerning this country. Corea, Cochinchina, Tunkin, Laos, Ava, Pegu, are tracts of land, of which we have but a very slender knowledge; and among the prodigious multitude of islands that lie scattered in the extremity of Asia, there is hardly any except Java, the centre of the Dutch commerce and empire, that comes within the plan of this general history. The same may be said of all those nations, that inhabit the middle of Africa, and of an infinite number of smaller nations in the new world. I shall only observe, that before the sixteenth century above one half of the inhabitants of the globe knew not the use of bread and wine; that a great part of America and the east of Africa are strangers to it still; and that we are obliged to carry these elements with us to those countries, to celebrate the mysteries of our religion.

Cannibals

Cannibals are much more rare, than is reported; within these fifty years our travellers have seen none. There are many species of men evidently different from each other. Several nations live still in the state of pure nature, and while we circumnavigate the globe, to see whether their countries afford any thing to satiate our cupidity, those people do not so much as inquire whether there is any other nation besides themselves; they spend their days in a happy indolence, which to us would be a great degree of misery.

There remains a vast deal more for our idle curiosity to discover: but if useful knowledge is the object of our inquiries, we have already discovered but too much.

C H A P. CXC VII.

Recapitulation of the foregoing History, to the Beginning of the fine Age of Louis XIV.

HAVING gone through the immense scene of revolutions that have happened in the world, since the time of Charlemagne, and even some ages before, till that of Louis XIV. let us now enquire what will be the fruits of our labour, and what advantage we may hope to derive from this history? We have taken a view of actions and manners, let us next consider what benefit we may reap from the knowledge of them.

Of Historical Facts.

A sensible reader will easily perceive, that he is to credit such great events only as carry with them an air of probability; and that he ought to look with pity and contempt on all those fabulous relations with which fanaticism and the spirit of fiction and credulity have, in every age, loaded the history of the world.

Constantine

Constantine triumphs over the emperor Maxentius; but most certainly the labarum, with its Greek inscription, never appeared to him in the clouds.

Clovis, yet reeking with the blood of those whom he had caused to be assassinated, turns Christian, and commits new murders; but no pigeon brought him an ampulla for his baptism, nor did an angel descend from heaven to present him with a standard.

A monk of Clairvaux might preach a crusade; but a man must be more than an idiot to write or believe that God worked miracles by the hand of this monk, in behalf of this crusade, which at the same time proved so unsuccessful.

Louis VII. king of France might die of a consumption; but no one, except an ignorant fanatic, could say, that he might have been cured by the embraces of a young maiden, had he not chosen to die a martyr to his chastity.

The history of every nation is disfigured by fiction, till the time that philosophy appeared to enlighten mankind; and when she rose upon this worse than Egyptian darkness, she found the minds of men so blinded by many ages of error, that she could with difficulty undeceive them; she found ceremonies, facts, and monuments established to consecrate falsehoods.

How for instance could any philosopher have been able to persuade the common people of Rome, assembled in the temple of Jupiter Stator, that this Jupiter never came down from heaven to stop the flight of the Roman legions? Or, how could he have attempted to deny, in the temple of Castor and Pollux, that these twin brothers had been seen fighting at the head of their armies? Would they not instantly have produced to him the stone on which the print of the feet of those gods was still to be seen? Would not the priests of Jupiter and of Pollux have said to him, "Incredulous wretch, you cannot but confess in beholding a rostral column, that we have gained a naval victory, of which that column is a monument: acknowledge therefore, that the gods came down to earth to fight

“ in our behalf ; and no longer blaspheme those miracles in presence of the monuments that bear witness to them.” Such in all ages have been the arguments of imposture and credulity.

A foolish princess builds a chapel to the honour of eleven thousand virgins. The priest of this chapel firmly believes that these eleven thousand virgins never had existence ; and yet he stirs up the populace to stone the philosopher who disputes it.

Monuments are to be taken as proofs of facts only when those facts, probable in themselves, are transmitted to us by cotemporary writers of wisdom and understanding.

The chronicles of the reign of Philip Augustus, and the abbey of la Victoire, are proofs of the battle of Bovines. But when you see the famous groupe of Laocoon at Rome, are you from that, to believe the fable of the Trojan horse ? Or in viewing the hideous statues of a St. Denis, on the road to Paris, will those monuments of ignorance and credulity convince you, that St. Denis walked above a league with his head under his arm after it was cut off ?

Most of those monuments that have been erected any length of time after the action they commemorate, are at best but proofs of an error consecrated by time : nay, we may sometimes even doubt the truth of medals that have been struck even at the time of an event ; for we have seen the English, deceived by a false piece of news, strike a medal, with these words on the exergue, “ Carthagena taken by Admiral Vernon ;” and almost the next post brought them an account of that admiral’s having raised the siege. If a nation so fruitful in philosophy could thus run the hazard of imposing upon posterity, what are we to think of nations and times buried in the deepest ignorance ?

We may safely credit those events attested by public registers, by the consent of cotemporary authors living in a capital, procuring lights from each other, and writing under the inspection of the principal persons of a nation. But for all those petty, dubious, and romantic facts related by obscure writers, in the corner

of some ignorant and uncivilized province, and those idle tales, filled with the most absurd and improbable circumstances, and with pretended miracles that are the disgrace of history, instead of being its ornament, let us rank them with the works of Voragine*, the Jesuit Caussin, Maimbourg, and others of their stamp.

Of MANNERS.

IT is easy to observe the great change of manners almost throughout the world, from the first irruptions of the Barbarians to the present time. The arts, which soften the manners by improving them, began to revive a little, so early as the twelfth century; but this dawn, being overcast by a cloud of the most absurd and infamous superstitions, threw every thing back into its pristine darkness; and these superstitions, having spread among the ignorant and brutal people of Europe, formed every where a mixture of barbarism and folly.

The Arabians civilized and improved Asia, Africa, and a part of Spain, till they were subdued by the Turks, and finally driven out by the Spaniards. Then ignorance took possession of these beautiful regions, and the manners of mankind from Bagdat even to Rome became gloomy, fierce and barbarous.

The popes were, for several centuries, elected only by force of arms; and the people, and even their sovereigns, were so weak, that an anti-pope of their own making, was, from the instant of his creation, revered by them as the vicar of God, and infallible. If this infallible personage happened to be deposed, he lost his holiness with his dignity, and his successor inherited the tribute of their adoration. And these earthly deities, who were in their turns either murderers or murdered, poisoners or poisoned; who enriched their bastards with the spoils of states, while they condemned fornication; who fulminated their anathemas against

* The author of the Golden Legend. V.

tournaments, while they themselves were carrying on wars; who excommunicated and deposed kings; and who made the deluded people purchase the remission of their sins, were at once the scandal, the abhorrence, and the gods of the greatest part of Christendom.

You have seen how in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the monks and bishops raised themselves to the sovereign power and dignity, and were every where at the head of the feudal government. They established the most ridiculous customs, as gross as their own manners; such as the exclusive right of entering the church with a falcon on their hand; the right of employing husbandmen to beat their ponds, that a baron, a monk, or a bishop might not be disturbed by the croaking of the frogs; the right of passing the first night with the new-married wives of their vassals, and the right of levying fines upon all traders being aliens; for at that time there were no traders in their own country.

You have also seen these sallies of ignorance and folly blended with the more bloody and fatal ones of religious wars.

The disputes of the popes with the emperors and kings, which began so early as at the time of Louis the Weak, did not entirely cease in Germany, till after the reign of Charles V; in England they were gotten the better of by the firmness of queen Elizabeth, and in France by the submission of Henry IV. Dogmatic madness has been another cause of the shedding so much blood; it has overturned more than one state, from the massacre of the Albigenes in the thirteenth century, to the little war of the Cevennes at the beginning of the eighteenth. During the space of five hundred years, there has been almost an uninterrupted flow of blood either in the field or upon the scaffold, sometimes in one country, and sometimes in another; and this evil has been of such long continuance, merely because mankind have neglected morality for their dogmas.

We must therefore once more acknowledge that in general this history is a collection of crimes, follies and misfortunes;

misfortunes; amongst which we have seen some virtues, and some few happy times, in the same manner as we discover here and there an habitation in savage deserts.

OF SERVITUDE.

THE man, perhaps, who in those barbarous times, which are called the middle ages, was the most deserving the veneration of his fellow creatures, was Pope Alexander III. It was he, who in a council held in the twelfth century, abolished servitude so far as he was able. It was this same pope, who, by his prudence triumphed over the violence of the emperor Frederic Barbarossa at Venice, and who obliged Henry II. king of England to ask pardon of God and man for the murder of Thomas Becket. He restored the rights of the people, and checked the criminality of kings. We have seen that before this period, all Europe, a few towns only excepted, was divided between two sorts of men; the lords of fiefs, who were either laymen or ecclesiastics, and slaves. The lawyers who assisted the knights, the magistrates and the stewards of manors, were in fact originally peasants. It is to Pope Alexander III. that mankind owe the recovery of their natural privileges, and that so many cities are indebted for their splendor. We have observed however, that this state of freedom has not extended every where. It has never penetrated into Poland; in that country as well as in Bohemia, Suabia and several other parts of Germany, the peasant is still considered as the property of his lord, and is sold with the estate. Even in France, in some provinces at a distance from the capital, there are some remains of this vassalage; since there are certain chapters and convents that are masters of all the property of their peasants.

In Asia, they are acquainted only with domestic slavery; but among christians the case is different. The polish peasant is a slave on the lands, but not in the house of his lord. We purchase domestic slaves

on

on the coast of Guinea. We have been blamed for this traffick; but a people who dispose of their children by sale, are surely more blameable than the purchaser; this kind of commerce is a proof of our superiority; he who gives himself a master, was born to have one.

Several princes, in endeavouring to release the vassals from the tyranny of their lords, attempted to bring the lords under the same kind of servitude; this was the occasion of so many civil wars.

Were we to credit several writers, who adapt every thing to their own ideas, we should be led to imagine, that republican states were more virtuous and happy than the monarchical; but without reckoning the bloody wars that were so long carried on between the Genoese and the Venetians, about the right of trading with the Mahometan nations, what troubles did not the republics of Venice, Genoa, Florence, and Pisa experience? And how often did the three latter change masters? If Venice preserved her liberty, she is indebted for that happiness wholly to her impassable marshes called the Lagoon.

It may be asked, how in the midst of so many tumults, intestine wars, conspiracies, crimes, and follies, there should have been so many persons who cultivated the useful and liberal arts in Italy, and afterwards in the other states of Christendom? It is what we do not observe under the Turkish yoke.

There must certainly have been something in the manners and genius of the people of our part of Europe, which is not to be found either in Thrace, where the Turks have fixed the seat of their empire, nor in Tartary from whence they originally came. There are three things that constantly influence the minds of men, climate, government and religion. This is the only possible method of explaining the ænigma of this world.

Of the Asiatic Manners compared with ours.

YOU may have observed that in the course of so many revolutions, countries, formerly the most civilized, both in Europe and Asia, are now inhabited by people who are but little better than savages. Some of the islands in the Archipelago, which were formerly so flourishing, are now reduced to the same state as the uncivilized parts of America. The country in which stood the cities of Artaxata, Tigranocertes, and Colchos, is not equal to our colonies. In several islands, and forests, and upon certain mountains, in the very centre of Europe, there are people to be met with, who are in no respect superior to the natives of Canada, or the negroes of Africa. The Turks are more civilized; but we hardly know of any city built by them; they have suffered the finest monuments of antiquity to fall to decay, and may be said to reign over ruins.

They have nothing in Asia that resembles the nobility of Europe. In no part of the east do we find an order of men distinguished from their fellows by hereditary titles, and by privileges annexed solely to birth. The Tartars seem to be the only people, who, in their *Mirzas*, have the least resemblance of such an institution. We do not find either in Turkey, Persia, the East-Indies, or China, any thing similar to those bodies of nobility, who constitute so essential a part of each European monarchy. We must travel as far as Malabar, to find any appearance of this institution, and even that is very different; it consists in a tribe devoted entirely to arms, who never intermix with any of the other tribes, and even disdain to have any communication with them.

The author of *the Spirit of Laws*, says, that there are no republican states in Asia; whereas an hundred different hords of Tartars, and tribes of Arabian freebooters, form so many different wandering republics. Besides, there were formerly in Asia several very flourishing republics,

publics, even superior to those of Greece; witness Tyre and Sidon: but we have seen none such since their decline. The great empires of that part of the world have swallowed up all the rest. The same author thinks he has found a reason for this want of liberty, in the vast plains of Asia. He pretends that a mountainous country is the most proper asylum of liberty; but certainly Asia is to the full as mountainous as Europe. Poland, which is a republic, is a flat country. Venice and Holland cannot be said to abound in mountains. Switzerland, which is a free country, is indeed situated in a part of the Alps; but its neighbours that inhabit the other part, have ever been in a state of slavery. It is certainly a refinement in reasoning to enquire into the physical causes of governments; but then we should not seek for causes that never had existence.

The greatest difference between us and the Orientals, is in our treatment of the female sex. We have no instance of a woman's reigning in the East, if we except a princess of Mingrelia, spoken of by Chardin, who tells us he was robbed by her. Women are indeed excluded from the throne of France, but they are allowed to be regents; they are permitted to ascend all the other thrones in Europe, except those of the empire and Poland. Another difference which arises from our manners with respect to women, is the custom of entrusting them to the care of men deprived of their virility; a custom established time immemorial in Asia and Africa, and which was sometimes introduced into Europe under the Roman emperors. At present, in our Christian part of Europe, we have not more than three hundred eunuchs for our chapels and theatres, whereas the seraglios of the East are filled with them.

They differ from us in every thing; in religion, government, manners, food, dress, as well as in their mode of thinking, in their expressions, and in their manner of writing. The greatest resemblance we have to them, is in that spirit of war, murder and destruction, which in all ages has desolated the earth. We must confess however, that this madness is less the

characteristic

cha
tha
eit
this
or
hav
A
whi
drec
secr
vent
ture
that
prin
law
mosa
rents
the
posse
riot i
beca
posse
kind
Persi
only
what
and t
perfor
purch
cus,
near
Th
do no
a plac
rous
foreign
crown
It is
women
they w
Von

characteristic of the inhabitants of China and India, than of ourselves. We know of no war undertaken by either of those people against the northern nations; in this respect they are preferable to us; but their virtue or rather their mildness has proved fatal to them. We have seen how they have been subdued.

Amidst those scenes of desolation and destruction which we have observed during the space of nine hundred years, we may perceive a love of order, which secretly animates the human race, and which has prevented its total ruin. This is one of the springs of nature which always recovers its strength; it was this that formed the law of nations; and from the same principle it is, that the law and the ministers of the law are revered at Tonquin, and in the island of Formosa, as well as at Rome. Children respect their parents in every country, and whatever may be said to the contrary, the son every where inherits his father's possessions. For altho' the son does not inherit a *timariot* in Turkey, or the lands of an *Omrab* in India, it is because the father has only an interest for life in those possessions, and in no country upon earth is such a kind of tenure considered as an inheritance. But in Persia, India, and indeed in every part of Asia, Japan only excepted, all the natives, and even foreigners of what religion soever, are allowed to purchase estates, and to leave them to their families. I am informed by persons worthy of credit, that a Frenchman has lately purchased a fine estate in the neighbourhood of Damascus, and that an Englishman has done the same thing near Bengal.

There are still some nations in Europe, whose laws do not allow a foreigner to purchase an estate, or even a place for burial within their territories. The barbarous *droit d'aubaine*, or law by which the property of foreigners dying in the kingdom are forfeited to the crown, still subsists in several christian countries.

It is a common notion with us, that in the East, the women are slaves, because they lead a domestic life. If they were slaves, they would be exposed to poverty at

the death of their husbands, which is certainly not the case, as they have a certain portion allotted to them by the laws, and obtain this portion in case of divorce. From one end of the world to the other, you will find laws established for the support of families.

In every country you will observe a check to arbitrary power, either by the laws, by the customs, or by the manners of the people. The Turkish sultan can neither disband the janizaries, nor seize on the property or extend his authority into the seraglios of his subjects. The emperor of China cannot publish an edict without the sanction of a tribunal. It is true that acts of the most horrid violence are experienced in every state. The grand vizirs are every day guilty of murder and rapine, but without being more authorized by the laws to commit such crimes, than the wandering Arabs and Tartars are to plunder the caravans.

Religion inculcates the same moral principles amongst the people of every nation without exception. The religious ceremonies of the Asiatics are many of them ridiculous and absurd, but their precepts are founded on justice. The dervise, the faquir, and the bonze, all agree in recommending equity and benevolence to mankind. The lower class of people in China have been reproached with knavery in their dealings; what encourages them perhaps in this vice, is their purchasing absolution from the bonzes at a most trifling price. The morality they are inspired with is good, altho' the indulgence that is sold to them is pernicious.

In vain have some of our travellers and missionaries described the oriental priests as preachers of iniquity; this is calumniating human nature; it is impossible that any religious society could ever be instituted with a view to encourage mankind to be vicious.

Altho' it has in former times been a custom with almost all nations to sacrifice human victims; yet this custom is far from having been frequent. This effect of barbarous ignorance, abolished in the old world, still continued in the new. But this detestable ceremony is not to be considered in the light of a religious precept,

cept, that influenced society; for though the Mexicans sacrificed their prisoners before the altars of their gods, and the Romans strangled theirs, after having dragged them in triumph, at their chariot wheels, to the Capitol, this was no more than one of the consequences of war, which prevailed equally with both nations, and which, when joined to a religious motive, became one of the most dreadful scourges of humanity. All I contend for is, that there never was an instance of any religious society or rite being instituted with a view to encourage men to the commission of vice. Religion has, indeed, been made a cloak for wickedness in all parts of the world; but it is every where instituted to promote virtue and goodness; and though superstition may have introduced fanaticism and wars, morality teaches universal peace and concord.

Nor are those writers less deceived who assert, that the Mahometan religion was established merely by dint of arms. The Mahometans have had their missionaries in India, and even in China; and the sect of Omar opposes the sect of Ali by word of mouth, as far as the coasts of Coromandel and Malabar.

The result of this picture is, that from one end of the universe to the other, there is a resemblance between every thing that is intimately connected with human nature; while every thing dependent on habit is different, so that if there is any resemblance it is by chance. The influence of habit is much more extensive than that of nature; it affects the manners and customs of men, and diffuses variety over the great scene of the universe; whereas nature is uniform, and every where establishes a small number of invariable principles; so that the foundation is every where the same, although a difference of cultivation may produce different effects.

Since Nature therefore has implanted self-interest, pride, and all the other passions in the heart of man, it is by no means strange, that during a period of nearly ten centuries, we have seen almost one continued series of crimes and disasters. If we ascend to more remote

times we shall find them equally bad. By means of habit however the evil has been effected every where in a different manner.

From this picture of Europe, from the reign of Charlemagne to the present time, you will easily judge, that this part of the world is, without comparison, better peopled, more civilized, more wealthy, and more enlightened than it was in his days; and that it is even superior to what any other part of the Roman empire was, Italy excepted.

It is a notion worthy only of the facetious author * of the Persian Letters, or of the new fangled paradoxes which we meet with in other writers no less frivolous, though delivered with an air of more gravity, to pretend that Europe is less populous than in the time of the ancient Romans.

If we consider the number of superb cities from Petersburg to Madrid, that have been built in places that were deserts six centuries ago; or the immense tracts of woods which covered the earth, from the borders of the Danube to the Baltic sea, and even to the heart of France, it will clearly appear, that such an extent of land could not have been cleared, without a great number of hands. And let others say what they will, agriculture and commerce have been infinitely more encouraged since the time of the Romans, than they were either then or before.

One reason, which has in general contributed to keeping up the population of Europe is, that in the numberless wars, which its several provinces have experienced, the conquered people have never been carried away out of their own country by the conquerors.

Charlemagne, it is true, depopulated the banks of the Weser; but this small spot was soon recruited again with inhabitants. The Turks carried away several Hungarian and Dalmatian families, out of their own country, and accordingly we find those countries, at present, but thinly peopled. Poland is also badly inhabited, but that is owing to the common people being still held in a state of slavery.

* M. de Montesquieu. T.

In what a flourishing condition then, would Europe have been at this time, had it not been for the continual wars, by which it has been rent on the slightest pretexts, and very often through mere whim and caprice? To what a degree of perfection would agriculture have attained, and how much more comfort and assistance would those arts, which prepare the produce of the earth for our use, have afforded us, had not such an astonishing number of persons, of both sexes, been doomed to pass their lives in useless retirement within the walls of a cloister! An improvement in humanity, which has been introduced amidst the scourge of war, and thus softened its horrors, has at the same time not a little contributed to save the common people from that destruction with which they were almost continually threatened. The great number of military forces, which are continually maintained by all crowned heads, is doubtless a very great evil in society; but, at the same time, as we have already observed, this very evil is productive of a good. The common people now leave the trade of war to their masters, without intermeddling therewith themselves; the inhabitants of a besieged town pass frequently from the service of one power to that of another, without a single life being lost on the occasion; and quietly become the property of him who has the strongest army, the best artillery, and the most money.

Germany, France and England, were for a long time laid waste by civil wars; but these disasters were soon repaired, and the present flourishing state of these countries shews, that the industry of mankind has even far exceeded their rage and fury. It is not the same with Persia, for that country has, for upwards of forty years, been a prey to the most shocking devastations; but if happily she should be re-united under one wise and good prince, she will probably recover herself in far less time than has been taken in ruining her.

When a nation is acquainted with the liberal arts, and its inhabitants are not absolutely enslaved, or carried away by a foreign conqueror, that nation will easily rise from her ruins, and recover her former strength.

REMARKS

R E M A R K S

BY WAY OF SUPPLEMENT

TO THE

ESSAY ON THE MANNERS AND
SPIRIT OF NATIONS.

I.

*How, and with what Views this Work was undertaken.—
Inquiries concerning certain Nations.*

MANY persons know, that the Essay on the Manners and Spirit of Nations, was undertaken about the year 1740, in order to reconcile, with the science of history, an illustrious lady*, who was mistress of almost all the others. This female philosopher was disgusted with two things, which abound in most of our historical compilations; viz. insipid details, and absurd falsehoods. She had never been able to get the better of the disgust, with which the earlier periods of our modern monarchies had inspired her, before and after Charlemagne. The whole seemed to her to be rude and uninteresting.

She had been desirous of reading the history of France, Germany, Spain and Italy, but had been disgusted with it. She had found it only a chaos, a rude heap of useless facts, the greater part of them false, and all of them badly digested. We may indeed consider them, as barbarous transactions related under barbar-

* The Marchioness de Chatelet. V.

ous names, and as insipid romances which we derive from Gregory of Tours. They afford us no information with respect to manners, government, laws, or opinions; nor shall we deem this very extraordinary, when we consider, that in those days there were no other opinions than the legends of monks, nor any other laws than those of plunder. Such is the history of Clovis and his successors.

What certain or useful knowledge can we derive from the adventures ascribed to Caribert, Chilperic and Clotharius? The only monuments of those miserable ages are a few convents founded by superstitious persons, who imagined they should make their peace with heaven by instituting retreats for idleness.

Nothing disgusted this lady so much as the puerility with which some writers, thinking to ornament those times of barbarism, have delineated Agiluph and Grison, as though they were a Cæsar and a Scipio. In reading father Daniel, she had no patience with his continual descriptions of battles, while she was desirous of informing herself on other more important subjects, such as the assemblies of the states and parliaments; the progress of legislation, chivalry, customs; and above all, the changes in society, which was formerly so savage and is at present so civilized. She looked into Daniel, for the history of the great Henry IV. and instead of it, she met with that of Father Cotton the Jesuit. In this same writer, she saw the father of St. Louis attacked with a mortal disease; his courtiers proposing a young girl to him as an infallible remedy, and this prince dying after all a martyr to chastity. This idle tale, which has been so often related of different princes, and which withal is so repugnant to the principles of physic and sound reason, is the subject of an engraving, which father Daniel has prefixed to the life of Louis VIII.

She could not comprehend how an historian who had common sense, could repeat, after so many ill informed writers, that the Mamalukes of Egypt were desirous of choosing St. Louis for their king; a prince who was
an

an enemy to them and their religion; who was likewise their prisoner, and who was equally a stranger to their language and manners. She was told that this fact was to be found in Joinville; but that writer speaks of it only as a popular report, and it is well known that we are not in possession of Joinville's genuine history.

The fable of the old man of the mountain who deputed two devotees from Mount Lebanon, to go to assassinate St. Louis at Paris, and who the next day, on the report of his virtues, dispatched two others to stop the pious enterprise of the two first; this fable I say, seemed to her to be far beneath the Arabian Nights.

In short, when she saw that Daniel, as well as all other historians, accounted for the defeat at Crecy, by saying that the bow-strings of the French troops had been wetted by the rain that fell during the battle, without recollecting that the rain must necessarily have had the same effect on the bow-strings of the English; when she read in the same work, that king Edward III. granted a peace, because he had been frightened by a storm, and that a fall of rain thus decided peace and war, she would proceed no farther, and threw away the book.

She inquired whether every thing that had been said of the prophet Mahomet, and of the conqueror Mahomet II. was true; and when she was told, that our historians had imputed to the latter, the crime of ripping open the bellies of fourteen of his pages, to know which of them had eaten one of his melons, she conceived the most profound and the justest contempt for all our histories.

Somebody put into her hands an account of the religious ceremonies of the Mahometans; she was astonished at the austerity of that religion, consisting as it does of a lent, the severity of which is almost incredible; a circumcision which is sometimes mortal; a rigorous obligation to pray five times a day; and lastly, an abstinence from wine, and gaming of every sort. At the same time, she was filled with indignation at the stupidity and meanness with which the conquered

G
ha
se
nu
mi

Ita
wi
of
law
tha
bar
pre
revo
A
Boss
the
scrib
she v
as g
when
much
pyran
stition
sisted
other
their
an an
placin
tion;
but fr
Greek
single
geome
Greek,
ceive i
people
they w
at the
the pen
picture
VOL.

Greeks, and our historians who have copied after them, have accused Mahomet of founding a religion altogether sensual, merely because he has limited to four, the number of wives which before his time, was undetermined in every part of Asia, and even in the Jewish law.

The little she had read of the histories of Spain and Italy, seemed to be still more disgusting to her. She wished for some history that should delineate the manners of nations, and the origin of such a variety of customs, laws and prejudices. She wanted to learn how countries, that had formerly been civilized, were again plunged into barbarism; what arts and sciences had been lost, and what preserved or discovered amidst the shocks of so many revolutions. These inquiries were worthy of her genius.

At length she read the Discourse of the celebrated Bossuet, on Universal History. She was struck with the eloquence with which that celebrated writer describes the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans; she wished to know, whether there was as much truth as genius in this picture; she was greatly surprized when she saw that the Egyptians, who have been so much extolled for their laws, their learning, and their pyramids, have almost always been an enslaved, superstitious and ignorant people, whose whole merit consisted in piling useless rows of stones one upon the other, by the order of their tyrants; that in building their palaces they had never been able to construct even an arch; that their whole architecture consisted in placing long flat stones upon pillars without proportion; that ancient Egypt never had a tolerable statue but from the hands of the Greeks; that neither the Greeks nor Romans had ever deigned to translate a single book from the Egyptian; that the elements of geometry composed in Alexandria, were the works of a Greek, &c. &c. This philosophical lady, could perceive in the laws of Egypt only those of a very confined people: she knew that from the time of Alexander, they were readily subdued by every one, who would be at the pains to attack them; in a word, she admired the pencil of Bossuet, though she was sensible that the picture he had drawn was far from being true. The

remarks she wrote in the margin of Bossuet's book; are still in the hands of some of her friends. In page 541, we find these words, "Why does the author say that Rome swallowed up all the empires in the universe? Russia alone is more extensive than the whole Roman empire."

She lamented that a man of so much eloquence should in fact forget the universe, while he was writing an universal history, and should speak only of three or four nations which have disappeared from the face of the earth.

What disgusted her the most, was to see that these three or four potent nations are in this same work sacrificed to the Jews, a petty people who take up three-fourths of the book. In the margin, at the end of the discourse on the Jews, we find the following note, in her hand writing, "These people may be spoken of in theology, but they certainly do not deserve to be much the subject of history."

In fact, what claim to our attention can a weak and barbarous nation have, that was never in possession of a country comparable to one of our provinces; that was never famous either for its commerce or the arts; that was almost always in rebellion or in slavery; till at length it was dispersed by the Romans, in the same manner as the Mahometan conquerors afterwards dispersed the Persis, a people so superior to the Jews, and who, moreover, were for a long time their masters, and of much greater antiquity. Above all, it seemed very strange, that the Mahometans who have changed the face of Asia and Africa, and of the finest part of Europe, should be forgotten in an history of the world. India, of which our luxury stands so greatly in need, and where so many powerful European nations have established themselves, surely ought not to have been passed over in silence.

In short, this sensible and ingenious lady could not bear that a writer should enlarge so much on the obscure inhabitants of Palestine, and at the same time say not a single word of the vast empire of China, the most ancient of any in the world, and without doubt, the

the best governed; since it has lasted the longest. She wished for a supplement to Bossuet's work, which ended with Charlemagne, and we readily engaged in this study, in order to instruct her and ourselves at the same time.

II.

The great Object of this History from the Time of Charlemagne.

THE object we had in view, was the history of the human mind, and not a detail of facts; which are almost always disfigured; we were not desirous of inquiring, for instance, of what family were the du Puits, or the Monthleris, who carried on a war with the kings of France, but to see the gradations by which mankind passed from the barbarous rusticity of those times, to the refinement of the present.

We soon observed, that from the time of Charlemagne, to the present, the disputes between the empire and the priesthood have been the source of all the revolutions in the Catholic part of Europe; this is the thread by which we are to be guided in the labyrinth of modern history.

The sovereigns of Germany, from the time of Otho I. imagined they had an indisputable right to all the territories possessed by the Roman emperors, and they considered all the other sovereigns as usurpers of their provinces: and yet with these pretensions, and with powerful armies, the emperors were hardly able to preserve a part of Lombardy; while the popes, who with difficulty obtained the privileges of sovereignty in Rome, without either troops or money, and wielding no other arms but those of opinion, gradually raised themselves above the emperors, obliged them to kiss their feet, and deposed or restored them at pleasure. In a word, there is hardly a sovereignty in the Catholic part of Europe, from the kingdom of Minorca to that of France, which the popes have not disposed of, either

in reality, by exciting seditions, or in idea by their bulls. Such was the system of a great part of Europe, till the reign of Henry IV. king of France.

It was therefore necessary to trace the history of the human mind; and by means of this, the chaos of events and factions, revolutions and crimes, became worthy the attention of judicious readers.

It was the opinions of mankind, that gave rise to those unhappy crusades of the Christians, against the Mahometans, and of the former against each other. It is certain that the Roman pontiffs encouraged these expeditions from self interested motives only. If they had succeeded in their views, the Greek church would have become subservient to them. They began by giving to a cardinal the kingdom of Jerusalem, which had been subdued by a hero. They would have conferred all the principalities and all the benefices of Asia Minor and Africa, and Rome would have done more by means of religion, than she did formerly by the virtues of her Scipio's, and Paulus Emiliuses.

III.

The History of the human Mind was wanting.

IN an history written according to this plan, we see errors and prejudices succeeding each other, in opposition to truth and reason. We see the dexterous and the fortunate enslaving the weak, and crushing the unfortunate; while the same dexterous and fortunate persons are themselves the sport of fortune, as well as the slaves they govern. In a word, mankind may be a little enlightened by this picture of their follies and misfortunes. Society is gradually taught to rectify its ideas, and men learn how to think.

Our aim therefore has been, not to collect an enormous multitude of facts, which serve only to efface one another, but to select the principal ones, and such as are the best established, and at the same time the best suited to direct the reader in his inquiries, and to enable

him to distinguish the extinction, the revival, and the progress of the human understanding; we have endeavoured to lead him to a knowledge of different nations, by delineating their manners and customs.

This method, which seems to be the only one suited to general history, has likewise been adopted by the philosopher †, who has lately written the history of England. The Abbé Veli and his learned commentator, have followed a similar plan in their history of France, which is so much superior to the histories written by Mézeray and Daniel.

IV.

Contemptible Customs do not always suppose a Nation contemptible.

THERE are cases in which we ought not to form our opinion of a nation, from popular superstitions and customs. Let us suppose, for instance, that Cæsar after conquering Egypt, being desirous of extending the commerce of the Romans, sent an ambassador to China, by the port of Arsinoë, the red sea, and the Indian ocean. The emperor Iventi was at that time upon the throne; the Chinese annals describe him as a very wise and learned prince. After having received Cæsar's ambassadors with all the politeness of a Chinese, he informs himself secretly, by his interpreters, of the customs, sciences, and religion of the Romans; a people as celebrated in the west, as the Chinese are in the east. He is told that the pontiffs of that nation have regulated their year in so absurd a manner, that the sun enters the celestial signs of the spring, before the Romans celebrate the first festivals of winter. He is informed that these people support, at an immense expense, a college of priests, who, by inspecting a bull's liver, or observing the manner in which the chickens eat their barley, are able to determine the pro-

† Mr. Hume,

per

per moment for an embarkation, or for giving battle; and that this sacred science was first brought to Rome by a little god named Tages, who rose out of the earth in Tuscany.

He is further told, that these people adore one only God, whom they stile the omnipotent and all merciful; and, that notwithstanding this, they have erected a temple to a courtesan named Flora; and that almost all the good women in Rome have little household deities or *penates*, four or five inches high, in their apartments, distinguished by different names; one of these little divinities being called the goddess of the breasts *, and another the goddess of the buttocks †, while to a third they give the appellation of the *god fart* ‡. The emperor Iventi laughs at this account, and the tribunals of Nanquin agree with him in thinking that the Roman ambassadors are fools, or impostors, who have assumed the title of envoys from the republic of Rome; but as the emperor's love of justice is equal to his politeness, he enters into a more particular conversation with the ambassadors; he then learns that the Roman pontiffs are very ignorant people, but that Cæsar is actually engaged in a reformation of the calendar; they acknowledge to him that the college of augurs was originally instituted in the earlier ages of the republic, and in times of barbarism, and that it had been suffered to continue, merely to gratify the vulgar; that all people of sense laughed at these augurs; that Cæsar had never consulted them; that, according to a great man named Cato, none of these augurs could ever speak of any of their brethren without smiling, and in short, that Cicero, the greatest orator and the best philosopher in Rome, had lately published a little work against these priests, in which he ridicules all the predictions and spells with which the world has been infatuated. The emperor's curiosity is immediately excited by this information; he wishes to read Cicero's performance; his

* La deesse des tetons.

† Le dieu pet.

‡ La deesse des fesses.

interpreters translate it, and he admires at once both the book and the Roman republic.

V.

In what Cases Customs affect the Spirit of Nations.

THERE are other cases in which popular superstitions and prejudices have such an influence on a whole nation, that their conduct is necessarily absurd, and their manners disgraceful, so long as these opinions predominate.

A philosophical bramin, for instance, arrives in Europe from India, and is told there is a pontiff in Italy, who has five or six hundred thousand regular troops, dispersed amongst five or six powerful nations. That of these troops, some have shoes, while others are barefooted; that some have beards, and that others are shaved; that some are in cowls, and others in caps; that they are all equally devoted to his service, and being armed with arguments and miracles, are ready to maintain that this Italian ought to dispose of all the kingdoms in the universe, his right being founded on three equivocations; and that consequently this right is acknowledged by a multitude who do not, and by some artful people who do reason.

The first equivocation is, what was said formerly in Asia to a fisherman named Peter, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and I will make thee a fisher of men." The second is founded on a letter attributed to this same Peter, in which he says he is at Babylon, whence it has been concluded that Babylon signifies Rome. The third is, that in Galilee two knives were found suspended from a ceiling, whence it has been demonstrated that of these two knives, one of them belonged to the man who is acknowledged as St. Peter's successor, and that as Peter was a fisher of men, his successor ought to include the whole world in his nets.

Our

Our Indian will have no great difficulty to conceive, that the princes of Europe would not be easily taken in the nets of this man, however respectable he might be; he will readily suppose at the same time, that the pretensions of this person must necessarily have been productive of discord; and when he is informed of all the wars, assassinations and poisonings that this dispute has occasioned, he will naturally observe, that "such fruits might well be expected from a tree of this sort."

If he is told at the same time, that in the later ages these disputes have been increased by a violent animosity of priest against priest, and of nation against nation, in matters of controversy that are absolutely incomprehensible; that a duke of Guise, a prince of Orange and two kings of France have been assassinated, a king of England put to death by the hands of the executioner, France, England and Ireland deluged with blood, and in short, that four or five hundred thousand persons have at different times had their throats cut in the name of God; he will shudder but he will not be surprised.

When he has read the history of the tigers, and comes to milder and more enlightened times, in which a work repugnant to common sense gives rise to more volumes than were left us by Greece or Rome; and in which, I know not what productions excite a general disturbance, he will fancy he is reading the history of the monkies*. In all these different cases he will perceive the reason why matters of opinion occasioned no trouble among the ancients, and why, on the contrary, they have given rise to so many ridiculous and horrid events, amongst almost all the modern nations of Europe, and especially amongst a people who inhabit between the Alps and the Pyrenées.

* The author, without doubt, alludes to the bull *Unigenitus*, and to that relating to confessions, which all Europe seems to consider as the two most ridiculous productions of this century. V.

VI.

Of the Power of Opinion.—Observations on the Manners of the Chinese.

A GREAT part of the world has therefore been changed by opinion. Not only whole empires have disappeared, without leaving any vestiges of their former greatness, but different religions have likewise been lost amidst these vast ruins. Christianity, which, as is well known, is truth itself, but which in this place we consider as an opinion in regard to its effects, destroyed the Greek, the Roman, the Syrian, and Egyptian religions in the age of Theodosius. It pleased God afterwards, that Mahometanism should root out the truths of Christianity in the East, in Africa and in Greece; that it should triumph over Judaism, over the ancient religion of the Magi, and over Sabism which is more ancient than either of these; that it should extend its influence to India, prove fatal to the god Brama and hardly stop at the Ganges. In our Christian part of Europe, a difference of opinion has been the means of separating the empire of Russia, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, England, the United Provinces, the half of Germany, and three quarters of Switzerland from the church of Rome.

The world affords only one instance of a vast empire, which has twice been subdued by superior force without ever changing its opinions; this is China.

The Chinese from time immemorial have had the same religion, the same system of morality they have at present, while the Goths, the Heruli, the Vandals and the Franks had hardly any other morality, than that of robbers who make certain laws for the preservation of their plunder.

It has been asserted in a certain part of Europe, that the Chinese is an atheistical government; but who are the persons who have made this strange accusation? They are the same who condemned Bayle so vehe-

Vol. IV. *Gen. Hist.*

R r

mently

mently for having said that a society of atheists might subsist, and who have written so much against him on a supposition that his idea was merely chimerical. Thus we find them contradicting themselves, as do all those who write from a spirit of party. They were deceived when they asserted, that a society of atheists could not possibly subsist, since the Epicureans who subsisted so long were a society of atheists; for surely the not admitting a God, and the admitting only useless gods who neither punish nor reward, is precisely the same thing with respect to the consequences.

Nor were they less deceived in reproaching the Chinese government with atheism. We observed in the Essay on the Manners and Spirit of Nations, that
 “ Nothing but the inconsiderate manner in which we
 “ carry on all our disputes, could have made us pre-
 “ sume to treat a government as atheistical, most of
 “ whose edicts speak of a Supreme Being, father of
 “ nations, recompensing, and punishing with justice,
 “ who has established between man and himself a cor-
 “ respondence of prayers and benefits, of transgressions
 “ and chastisements *.”

Some of our journalists have pretended to doubt the authenticity of these edicts; but they have only to read the collection of letters published by the missionaries, or to consult the third volume of the History of China, in the 41st page of which, they will find the following inscription, “ To the true principle of all things, who
 “ is without beginning and without end, who hath
 “ produced and who governs the universe, and whose
 “ goodness and justice are infinite, &c.”

It will be alledged, perhaps, that the Chinese believe God to be material; but it would be much more excusable in the Chinese to load us with this reproach, if they were to see the pictures in our churches, in which God is represented with a long beard, as the ancients used to paint their Jupiter. We are every day insulting foreign

* See Vol. I. page 25.

nations,

n
cu
a
ra
to
ne
ev

C
exc
and
of
late
they
vent
V
tro
this
earth
dispu
and
Th
as th
them
pets
you b
sacran
two sa
tempt
am en
libly fi
till ou
are ref
The
when t
Louis X

nations, without reflecting how ridiculous many of our customs may appear to them. We presume to ridicule a people, who possessed the purest religion and morality upwards of two thousand years before we began to emerge from a state of barbarism, and whose manners and customs have undergone no change, while every thing amongst us has been metamorphosed.

VII.

Opinion, the Subject of War in Europe.

OPINION has hardly ever proved a source of civil war except among Christians; for the schism of the Turks and the Persians, has never been any other than an affair of politics. The religious civil wars that have desolated a great part of Europe are the more horrid, as they originated from a principle which ought to prevent every kind of war.

Within these fifty years, reason having gradually introduced herself among us, seems to begin to root out this pestilential disorder which has so long infected the earth. We are beginning now to despise theological disputes, to suffer religious dogmas to rest in peace, and to content ourselves with teaching morality.

There are certain opinions which may be considered as the standards, under which different nations range themselves; their particular dogmas are then the trumpets that sound the charge. I reverence images and you break them down; you receive two kinds in the sacrament, while I receive only one; you acknowledge two sacraments while I admit seven; you are even attempting to put down the religious ceremonies which I am endeavouring to support; we must therefore infallibly fight. And this kind of madness will continue till our minds, fatigued and exhausted by fanaticism, are restored by reason.

The opinion which originates from factions, changes when those factions are appeased. Thus, in *The Age of Louis XIV.* the reader will perceive, that the people of

Paris did in no respect think, as they did at the time of the league. It is necessary however to transmit the remembrance of these wanderings of the human mind to posterity, in the same manner as physicians describe the plague of Marseilles although it is cured. They who should say to an historian, "Make no mention of our past extravagancies," would be like the children of one who had died of the plague, and who should be unwilling to have it known, that their father had a carbuncle.

The great number of public prints in Europe, is sometimes productive of a very good effect, by deterring men from criminal actions, and stopping the hand that is just about to commit them. More than one potentate has hesitated to do an iniquitous deed, merely because he feared it would be immediately registered in all the archives of the human mind.

We are told, that an emperor of China was one day reprimanding and threatening the historian of the empire: "What, said he, have you the impudence every day to write down my faults?" "Such is my duty, replied the scribe, and this same duty enjoins me instantly to write down your threats and complaints." The emperor blushed, and retired, saying to him, "Well; mark down every thing, and I will endeavour to do nothing that shall merit the reproaches of posterity." If it is true, that a prince who had an hundred millions of subjects at his command, knew so well how to respect the rights of truth, what ought the Sorbonne to do? Can this order of preaching friars have any reason to complain? Would even the senate of Rome have dared to require that truth should be betrayed in their favour?

VIII.

Of Gunpowder.

AS there are opinions that have wholly metamorphosed the manners of mankind, so there are inventions

tions that have entirely changed the face of things in the world. Such is the art of making gunpowder. It is certain that it was not the benedictine Roger Bacon, but another benedictine, who discovered this secret towards the middle of the fourteenth century; and that it was a Jesuit who first taught the Chinese the art of casting cannon in the seventeenth. This word *cannon*, which signifies only a *tube*, did, I believe, for a long time lead us into mistakes. So early as the year 1338, they made use of long tubes of iron, by means of which, burning arrows, covered with sulphur and pitch, were thrown into places besieged. These engines constructed in a thousand different forms, made a part of the artillery. This is the reason why it has been supposed that at the siege of the castle of Puiguillaume, in 1338, they made use of cannon similar to those in vogue at present. To demolish a thick wall requires at least a twenty-four pounder, and it is certain that no such were constructed at that time. It is a mistaken notion that the English made use of cannon at the battle of Cressy in 1346; there is no mention made of any such circumstance in the records of the Tower of London, and such a fact had it really happened, would doubtless not have been omitted.

In the new history of France, mention is made of a cannon cast at Amberg in 1301, and which is said still to be preserved there with the above date upon it. This singular circumstance excited my curiosity, and I was desirous of inquiring into it. I accordingly applied to the count d'Holnstein of Bavaria, who very obligingly undertook to make the necessary inquiries. He assures me there is no such cannon existing, and that the town of Amberg was not fortified till 1326. What gave rise to the mistake, was the tomb of one Mergue Martin, a mathematician of some celebrity for his time, and who made cannon in the upper Palatinate; he has a cannon under his feet with two escutcheons, one representing a griffin, and the other a little cannon mounted upon a carriage with two wheels. His epitaph informs us that he died in 1501; and this date is so well marked,

marked, that it is strange any body should have mistaken it for 1301. If all the antiquities, or rather all the antique stories that are related to us, were inquired into with as much care, we should find many an old error to rectify.

IX.

Of MAHOMET.

THE greatest change ever produced in the world by opinion, was the establishment of Mahometanism. The mussulmen in less than a century made themselves masters of an empire more extensive than that of the Romans. This revolution, which appears so considerable in our eyes, is in fact only as an atom that has changed its situation in the immensity of things, and in the innumerable multitude of worlds, with which all space is filled; but it is at least an event that ought to be considered as one of the wheels of the machine of the universe, and as a necessary effect of the eternal and immutable laws that govern it: for can any thing happen that hath not been determined by the Master of all things? Nothing is but what ought to be.

How can any one imagine that a certain order of things exists, and yet that every thing is not conformable to this order? The Eternal having fabricated the world, how can any part of his work be out of the place allotted to it by the supreme Artist? Words may be uttered repugant to this truth, but no person will believe them who is capable of reflection.

Count de Bouillainvilliers pretends that God raised up Mahomet, in order to punish the Christians of the East, who disgraced their religion by their disputes, who extended the worship of images to the most scandalous idolatry, and who paid greater adoration to Mary the mother of Jesus, than they did to the Holy Ghost, who in fact had no temple dedicated to him, altho' he was the third person of the Trinity. But if God thus aimed at punishing the Christians, he likewise punished

punished the Parfis, and the followers of Zoroaster who did not seem to have occasioned any civil commotions by their theology; God must likewise have punished the Sabæans; and all this is supposing the Deity to have partial and particular designs. It seems strange, that a Being who is represented as eternal and immutable, should change his general decrees, that he should stoop to little views; that he should establish christianity in the East, and in Africa, merely for the sake of destroying it, and that by a particular providence, he should sacrifice the religion announced by his Son to a false religion. Either he must have changed his laws, and this would be an inconceivable mutability in the supreme Being, or the abolition of christianity in those climates was an infallible effect of general laws.

Several other learned men, and especially Mr. Sale, to whom we are indebted for the best translation of the Alcoran, seem inclined to adopt the opinion, that Mahomet did in fact promote the glory of God, by destroying the worship of the sun in Persia, and that of the stars in Arabia. But the Magi did not adore the sun; they revered it as an emblem of the divinity; of this there is no doubt. The two principles were not admitted in Persia before the time of Manes. The Magi never paid adoration to what we call the evil spirit; they considered it exactly in the same light as we consider the devil, as we may perceive, if we look into the Sadder, or ancient commentary on the Zend, which is the most ancient of all books. Upon the whole, the religion of Zoroaster was preferable to that of Mahomet, who evidently adopted several of its dogmas.

In regard to the Arabians, it is true they worshipped the stars, but this worship was certainly subordinate to that of a supreme deity, the creator, preserver, avenger and rewarder of all: this appears by their ancient formula: "O God! I devote myself to thy service; I
"devote myself to thy service, O God! thou hast for
"companions only those over whom thou art absolute
"master, thou art the master of every thing that exists."

The

The unity of God was acknowledged time immemorial, by the Arabians, altho' they admitted, as well as the Persians and Chaldæans, an enemy to the human race, whom they called *Satan*; the unity of God and the existence of this Satan, subordinate to God, are the foundation of the book of Job, who certainly lived on the confines of Arabia, and who, by many learned writers, is with great reason supposed to have been prior to Moses by about seven generations.

Altho' the Mahometans destroyed the religion of the Magi and the Arabians, yet we do not see how this rebounded to the glory of God. Mankind have always been inclined to describe the Deity as fond of glory, because they are so themselves, in the same manner as they have formed him after their own image. All the world, the philosophers only excepted, have considered God as a prince filled with vanity, who feels himself hurt when you omit the title of *highness*, and call him only *your excellency*, and who is displeased when you bow to any other than himself in his presence.

The learned translator of the Alcoran is a little guilty of that weakness which every translator has for his author, when he seems inclined to consider Mahomet as a fanatic from his heart. "It is easy to conceive," says he, "that he might believe the alluring men from idolatry and superstition, to be a meritorious work, and that by degrees, and the assistance of a warm imagination, which is naturally the lot of the Arabians, he might really think himself destined to reform the world."

There are few people however, who will believe that there could be much sincerity in a man who pretended to have received the leaves of his book from the angel Gabriel, and to have been carried into heaven upon the beast Alborac; but at the same time I acknowledge that a person filled with enthusiasm and great designs, might dream of his being transported into heaven, and of his conversing with angels; such fancies seem to enter into the composition of human nature. Gassendi, the philosopher, relates that he restored a poor man

to his
here
with
a w
drug
pass
to fle
the m
congr
remi
and C
shewe
him h
ing, a
It i
in the
of the
and co
Mahom
well,
where
great
could
for the
He wa
gained
queror
greate
earthly
but the
cause
with te
that is
hized th

Of th
OPIN
lips; t
Vol.

to his reason, who had fancied himself a wizard; and here is the manner in which he acted: he began with persuading the man that he was desirous of being a wizard as well as him; he requested some of his drugs, and pretended to rub himself with them; he passed the night in the same chamber: the wizard went to sleep, and was muttering to himself the whole night; the moment he waked, he embraced Gassendi, and congratulated him on his having been at the meeting, reminding him at the same time of every thing that he and Gassendi had done with the goat. Gassendi then shewed him the drugs that were untouched, convinced him he had spent the whole night in reading and writing, and thus at length cured him of his conceit.

It is probable that Mahomet was originally a fanatic, in the same manner as Cromwell was at the beginning of the civil war; both of them employed their genius and courage in making their fanaticism successful; but Mahomet performed much greater things than Cromwell, because he lived at a time, and among a people where it was possible to do them. He was certainly a great man himself, and one who formed great men. He could not fail of being either a martyr or a conqueror, for there was no medium for him between these two. He was constantly victorious, and all his victories were gained by a small army over a great one. ~~As~~ As a conqueror, legislator, monarch and pontiff, he acted the greatest part that can possibly be played upon this earthly stage, in the eyes of the generality of mankind; but the sages will always prefer Confucius to him, because he was neither of these, but contented himself with teaching the purest system of morality, to a nation that is more ancient, more numerous, and more civilized than that of the Arabians.

X.

Of the temporal Grandeur of the Caliphs and the Popes.

OPINION and war raised the grandeur of the caliphs; that of the popes was founded on opinion and Vol. IV. *Gen. Hist.* S s intrigue.

intrigue. We are not going to enter into a comparison of the two religions, or to point out the difference between church and mosque, or bishop and muphti; our view is to consider politics and events.

In the ordinary course of things, war may procure extensive territories; intrigue can procure only small ones; but then the latter last the longest, whereas the same war to which we are indebted for the former, may sooner or later destroy them. Thus the popes have by degrees acquired an hundred leagues of territory, while the caliphs, who were at one time masters of twelve hundred, were at length stripped of the whole. The caliphs were in possession of Spain, Africa, Egypt and Syria, part of Asia Minor and Persia, in the seventh and eighth centuries, when the popes were nothing more than bishops subject to the exarch of Ravenna. The title of the pope at that time was, (" Vicar of St. Peter, " and bishop of Rome.") He was chosen by the people, as was the case with all the other bishops, both of the East and West. The clergy of Rome used to address themselves to the exarch in the following terms: " We beseech you, who are charged with the imperial " ministry, to give orders for the consecration of our " father and pastor." At the same time, they wrote as follows to the metropolitan of Ravenna: " Holy father, we beseech you to obtain of the lord exarch, " the ordination of him whom we have chosen." Some of those papers are still preserved at Rome. It is certain therefore that the popes before the reign of Charlemagne, had no pretensions to the sovereignty of Rome. It may be pretended perhaps, that Gregory II. threw off the yoke of his emperor who resided at Constantinople, but surely this Gregory was nothing more than a rebel.

Charlemagne became emperor of Rome, and his successors continued to assume the same title; this makes it still more evident that the popes could not be emperors of Rome under them. Assuredly, the others did not allow the bishop to be the sovereign of a city which they considered as the capital of their empire.

Gregory

Gregory VII. although he kept the emperor Henry IV. barefoot, and in his shirt, in his anti-chamber at Canossa, never dared however to assume the title of sovereign of Rome, under any denomination whatever.

The Norman princes who conquered Naples, did homage for it to the pope; but no historian ever attempted to prove that this homage was paid to the Roman pontiff, as sovereign of Rome. The first investiture given to the Norman princes was by the emperor Henry III. in 1407.

The second investiture is of a different kind, and is highly deserving our attention. Pope Leo IX. having engaged in a kind of crusade against those princes, was defeated and taken prisoner by them; they behaved to their captive with great humanity, a thing not very common in those days; and the pope in taking off the excommunication he had issued against them, granted to them all they had taken, and all they should be able to take, in quality of an hereditary fief of St. Peter, *de Sancto Petro hereditatis feudo*.

To whom did Charles of Anjou do homage for Naples and Sicily? Was it to the person of Clement IV. as sovereign of Rome? No; it was to the church of Rome and to the popes canonically elected, *pro regno Siciliæ & aliis terris nobis ab ecclesia Romana concessis*. "For the kingdom of Sicily and other territories granted to us by the church of Rome." This liege homage was in fact therefore what it was originally, an offering to St. Peter, an act of devotion, from whence resulted murders, assassinations and poisonings. The pope was so far from being sovereign of Rome at that time, that money was coined in the name of this very Charles of Anjou, at a time when he was only a senator of Rome. There are still to be seen some crowns of that time, on one side of which we find the words, "*Carolus, senatus populusque Romanus*," and on the reverse, "*Roma caput mundi*." There are similar coins with the names of the Colonnæ and the Ursini; there are likewise some pieces of money bearing the pope's name, but in none of those pieces is the pope's sovereignty expressed:

pressed: the word *dominus*, which was very rarely made use of, was a title of honour that none of the kings of France, Germany, Spain, or England ever made use of, if I mistake not; nor is this word *dominus* to be seen on any of the popes coin.

In the bloody quarrels of the emperor Frederick Barbarossa with pope Alexander III. the latter never ventured to stile himself sovereign of Rome; he was in possession indeed of considerable tracts of land, but had certainly no pretensions to the city, in which the emperor had been crowned king of the Romans.

Gregory IX. after accusing the emperor Frederick II. of preferring Mahomet to Jesus Christ, did indeed depose him from the throne, according to the insolent and absurd custom of those days, but he did not dare to place himself in his stead, or to stile himself the temporal prince of Rome.

Innocent IV. afterwards deposed the same emperor in the council held at Lyons, but without taking Rome for himself; the Roman empire still subsisted or was supposed to subsist. The popes did not venture to call themselves kings of the Romans, but they were so as far as they were able. The emperors were consecrated and stiled kings of the Romans, although they were not so in reality. What then was Rome? a city in which the bishop had a very considerable influence, in which the government was frequently in the hands of the people, and in which the emperors had no kind of authority, except when they came to it with a powerful army, as did the Alarics and the Othos.

The popes considered not only the kingdom of Naples, but likewise those of Portugal, Arragon, Grenada, Sardinia, Corsica, Hungary, and above all England as feudatory to the holy see; but they neither stiled themselves, nor were they, masters of those countries. The submission of those kingdoms to the see of Rome, was the effect of ambition as well as of opinion and superstition. Whenever a prince disputed the sovereignty of a province, he did not fail to accuse his competitor of being an heretic, or a promoter of heretics;

of having married his cousin, and of eating flesh on Fridays. Money was given to the pope, and he in return disposed of the province by a bull; this bull became the standard under which the people rallied, and thus the pope, without being master of an inch of ground in Rome, gave away kingdoms elsewhere.

The same thing happened to the caliphs in their decline, as to the popes in their rise. The sultans of Asia, and of Egypt and the rest of Africa, as well as the kings of Spain, received the investiture from the caliphs, even when the latter had no longer any possessions. Such was the confusion in which the earth was so long involved.

The German bishops taking advantage of the distracted state of the empire, made themselves sovereigns and assumed the title of princes, at a time when the popes were far less powerful in Rome, than a bishop of Wurtzbourg in Germany. So little power had the popes at Rome, that during seventy years they were obliged to take refuge in Avignon.

Pope Martin V. who was elected at the council of Constance, is the first, I believe, who is represented upon coin with the triple crown, invented by Boniface VIII. The popes could not be said to be masters of Rome, till they got possession of the castle of St. Angelo, which did not happen till the fifteenth century.

At length however they have reigned there, but without ever daring to stile themselves kings of Rome; while the emperors who have continued to be kings of that city have never ventured to reside there. The world is governed by contradictions, and this, which has lasted ever since the days of Charlemagne, is of all other the most striking.

Charles V. king of the Romans, besieged and sacked the city of Rome; but to remain there only three months, and to pretend to fix there the seat of his empire, is what that victorious prince never dared to undertake.

How

How then are we to reconcile the sovereignty of the pope with that of the king of the Romans? Time has insensibly solved this problem. It would seem as if the emperors and popes were tacitly agreed, that the former should reign in Germany, and the latter in Rome. This arrangement no longer surprizes us, because we are accustomed to it; but it is not the less strange on that account.

As a proof how strangely fate disposes of things in this world, we may observe that he who established the sovereignty of the popes on the most solid foundation, was the same Alexander VI. who was guilty of so many horrid murders, committed by the hands of his incestuous son in Romania, Imola, Forli, Faenza, Rimini, Fano, Bertinoro, Urbino, Camerino, and above all, in Rome. What was the title of that man? That of *servant of the servants of God*; and what would now be the prerogative at Rome of him, who stiles himself king of the Romans? He would have the honour to hold the pope's stirrup, and to serve as deacon at high mass.

XII.

Of the MONKS.

The monks owe their institution to opinion more than to any other cause. We have given them a place in the *Essay on the Manners and Spirit of Nations*, although this part of the human race has been omitted in all *profane* histories. After all, they are men, and this body, which is so foreign to the world, has even produced some great men. The author has treated them with much more moderation, than the celebrated bishop of Bellai, and other writers have done, who were not of the Romish communion. He has spoken impartially of Jesuits, for in this manner an historian ought always to speak of every thing.

The public good ought to be preferred to every particular society, and the state to monks; this is well enough

enough known. Mankind have long been sensible how greatly these eternal families, perpetuated as they are at the expence of society in general, impede population, agriculture, and the useful arts; and how dangerous they are in times of trouble. It is certain there are provinces in Europe that swarm with monks, and yet are in want of husbandmen.

A writer of paradoxes pretends that the monks are useful, because their lands are better cultivated than those of the poor nobility; but for this very reason it is that they are injurious to the state, since their convents have been founded as it were on the ruins of the nobility. It is indisputable that an hundred gentlemen, each possessing an annual income of two thousand livres, would be of more real utility to the king and the state, than an abbot who possesses two hundred thousand. London affords us a striking instance of the truth of this observation; for in a certain quarter of that city, formerly inhabited by thirty monks there are at present three hundred families. We are sometimes in want of husbandmen, soldiers, sailors and mechanics, while so many subjects are languishing in cloisters.

The greater number of these monks are slaves to a master whom they address on their knees, calling him "my lord;" and yet in this state of humiliation they derive a secret vanity from the grandeur of their despotic chief.

Many of them, it is true, when far advanced in life begin to detest the chains they loaded themselves with at an age when men ought not to be allowed to dispose of themselves in this manner; but at the same time they love their order; and these slaves have their eyes so fascinated, that the greater number of them would not accept of liberty, even were it offered to them; they are like the companions of Ulysses who refused to resume the human form. In Italy and Spain they have ample amends made them, for the sacrifice they have made of themselves, and with great insolence suffer the women to kiss their hands. In Germany their abbots are princes. A monkish prince has other monks for his
great

great officers, and a convent is thus converted into a court which serves to nourish ambition. Since this was first written every thing has greatly changed, and mankind have at length begun to open their eyes.

The monks, by their institution, are secluded from the rest of mankind, and yet they have aimed at governing the rest of the world. At first they were a set of wanderers bound by no vows; and after a time were received into the hierarchy of the Greek church; but they have been considered as enemies to the Latin hierarchy. The different catholic governments have frequently had it in contemplation to diminish their number, but have never as yet been able to succeed in such an attempt. In protestant countries they are entirely rooted out.

At length the Jesuits have for the second time * been driven out of France. They have been reproached with deriving privileges from the court of Rome, that were incompatible with the laws of the state; but all other religious orders have nearly the same privileges. The Jesuits have been banished out of Portugal for political reasons, and for having attempted to assassinate the king. The motives that led to their expulsion from France, were their attempts to take the lead in polite literature, in the church, and in the state. Their fate ought to be a lesson to all the other religious orders. There are some who are envied on account of their great riches, but who are respected for their antiquity and literary labours †; there are a multitude of others that are less worthy of notice.

Every body allows, that instead of these monastic retreats, where men make a vow to God to live at the expense of others, and to be of no use to society, it would be right to establish an asylum for old people who are no longer able to work. It is certain, that every profession has its invalids, who shudder at the mention of an alms-house or hospital, but who would

* See *The Age of Louis XIV.* V.

† The author alludes to the order of Benedictines. T.

not be ashamed to end their days, in a community instituted under another name. Every body says this, and yet nobody has as yet attempted to change the monasteries (which are so burthenfome to the state) into asylums for old age.

What the author of the *Essay on the Manners, &c.* has said on this subject, seems to be perfectly agreeable to the sentiments of the public in general; he is of opinion that the number of useful subjects ought to be increased, and that of usefess ones retrenched. The young man who has talents, and who buries them in a cloister, does injury to the public as well as to himself. What would have been the consequence if Corneille, Racine, Moliere, La Fontaine, and so many others had taken it into their heads to turn Capuchins or Carmelites, at a time of life when men cannot possibly know their own minds.

XIII.

Of the CRUSADES.

THE crusades may be considered as the most memorable effect of opinion. The princes of the West, jealous of each other, were persuaded that it was necessary for them to go to the farther end of Syria. If they were unsuccessful they would be all exterminated; if they were successful they would destroy one another.

Of all the crusades, that which St. Louis entered into against Egypt was the worst conducted, and that which he undertook against Africa the most singular, as it had no relation to the original object of those expeditions, which was to get possession of Jerusalem; a city, by the bye, of no sort of consequence to any of the western nations; a city, from which they might naturally be expected to turn aside with horror, as being the place where their God was put to death; a city, in which they could not expect to punish the Jewish nation, who in their eyes had been guilty of this murder, since those people were no longer to be found there. Besides, the

situation of this city was in a barren and desolate country ; but yet to this country, however desolate, the crusaders could not have the most distant pretensions. It belonged perhaps of right to the emperors of Constantinople, who had formerly been stripped by the crusaders themselves, but it was then in the possession of the Tartars, who had taken it from the Mussulmen, so that the crusaders could not even have it in view to oppose the religion of Mahomet.

The Abbé Veli in his new history of France, accuses the author of the foregoing essay, of inventing that passage, in which he asserts that St. Louis undertook the crusade against Tunis, merely to second the ambitious and interested views of his brother Charles of Anjou, king of the Two Sicilies. But most assuredly the author did not invent this fact, which is extremely interesting in the history of the human mind ; it is to be met with in all the old chronicles of Italy, and is transcribed by de l'Isle, in the third volume of his Universal History, page 295. And again in Mezeray, we find the following passage under the year 1269, " As to " St. Louis, he undertook the expedition against " the kingdom of Tunis from two motives ; one of " these was, that he thought the conquest of that " country would open a way for him into Egypt, " without which he could not possibly keep the holy " land ; *the other, that his brother had persuaded him to it,* " in order to make the coast of Africa tributary to his " kingdom of Sicily, in the same manner as it had been " in the time of Prince Roger, the Norman." Rapin says exactly the same thing in his History of England, under the reign of Henry III. It is therefore but too true, that the heroic simplicity of St. Louis, made him a victim to the ambition of his brother, who was to accompany him in the expedition ; and this was one of the reasons that induced the barbarous Charles of Anjou, to cause Conradin, the lawful heir to the crown of Sicily, together with his cousin the duke of Austria, and Prince Conrad, one of the sons of the emperor Frederick II. to die by the hands of the executioner.

He

He thought it consistent with his politics to put those princes to death, that he might go to pillage Africa without any fear of disturbances in Sicily during his absence. What preparations for an holy expedition! But in what respect was it so holy? There could be no other view in it, than to get the plague and some plunder on the ruins of Carthage. It was under such fatal auspices, that St. Louis set out on the crusade, and his brother did not arrive in Africa till after his death. If the king of France really thought of penetrating from Tunis into Egypt, such an enterprize would have been much more dangerous than his first crusade, and his troops would have perished in the deserts of Barca, as easily as on the banks of the Nile.

The author is aware that William of Nangis, who wrote history in the manner it was written in his time, pretends that the sheriff or emir of Tunis, was much inclined to embrace Christianity, and that several of his letters to the king of France gave that monarch great hopes of his conversion. The same writer asserts, that St. Louis was about to lay waste the territories of that Mahometan prince by fire and sword, in order to bring him over the more speedily to the Christian religion. How eligible this mode of making converts is, I leave to the sensible reader to determine. It is probable, that the maxim of compelling men to change their opinions, was admitted in politics as well as in theology, and that they were disposed to treat the Mussulmen in the same manner as the Albigenfes. We may safely contradict the opinions of this William; not because he is an unfaithful historian, but as being a credulous writer, who forty years after the death of St. Louis, wrote down without discernment, every thing he had heard said upon the subject. These idle stories of a sovereign of Tunis being disposed to turn Roman catholic, and of a king of France laying siege to his capital, in order to bring him over to the church, are of the same stamp as the fables invented by the old man of the mountain, or the account of the crown of Egypt's being offered to a king of France. The enterprizes of those days were romantic, but the imagina-

tions of historians were far more so. The reader cannot but acknowledge, that St. Louis would have shewn much greater prudence, had he staid and governed his subjects peaceably at home, than he did by exposing his daughter, his son's wife, his sister-in-law and his niece, (all of whom accompanied him in his expedition) to the horrors of pestilence and war on the coast of Africa.

It is worthy of observation, that the abbé Veli who has so unjustly censured the author of the *Essay on the Manners of Nations*, has copied him in many places without quoting him, in the same manner as father Barre, in his History of Germany, has taken upwards of fifty pages, word for word, from the History of Charles XII. It is right to notice these plagiarisms, because among cotemporary writers, it is difficult to determine after a certain time which of them plundered the other. But let us not forget, at the same time, that the right we are thus attempting to vindicate is a mere trifle.

XIV.

Of Peter of Castile, surnamed the Cruel.

THAT Peter the Cruel revenged himself in a barbarous manner, I most willingly allow: but we find him betrayed and persecuted by his bastard brothers and even by his wife; supported indeed by the Black Prince, the greatest man of his age, but having France necessarily against him, merely because he was protected by the English; at length we see him oppressed by a set of plunderers and assassinated by his bastard brother; for it is certain he was unarmed when he was slain, and Henry of Transamare who assassinated him, and afterwards usurped his throne, has been respected by historians merely because he was successful.

We will allow, that Peter of Castile carried with him to the grave the name of Cruel; but what epithet shall we give to the tyrant, who brought Conradin and

and the duke of Austria to the scaffold? and by what name shall we distinguish the many other scenes of horror that have been transacted in Europe?

XV.

Of Charles of Navarre, surnamed the Bad.

IT is allowed that Charles *the Bad*, king of Navarre, was a wicked prince, and that Don Pedro king of Castile, surnamed *the Cruel*, deserved that title; but let us see whether in those days of chivalry there was much mildness and generosity among princes. John *the Good*, king of France, began his reign by killing his constable, the count d'Eu. He bestowed the post of constable on his favourite don la Cerda, a Spanish prince, and invested him with the estates that belonged to his brother-in-law Charles king of Navarre. This act of injustice could not fail to excite the indignation of a prince of the blood, who was sovereign of a fine kingdom. His father had been stripped of the provinces of Champagne and Brie; and now Angouleme and other territories which his wife, who was sister to the king of France, had brought him as her marriage portion, were given away to a foreigner. In order to revenge the affront he was led to commit a horrid crime, by employing persons to assassinate the constable la Cerda, and what is melancholy likewise, he obtained, by means of this murder, the justice that had before been refused him. The king of France agreed to all his pretensions. But how did this John the Good behave after this public reconciliation? He repaired to Rouen, where he found the king of Navarre at dinner with the dauphin and four knights; he seized on the persons of these knights, and ordered their heads to be cut off without any form of trial; the king of Navarre was conveyed to prison, under a pretence that he had entered into a treaty with the English; but as king of Navarre, he had surely a right to engage in this pretended treaty; and although as count of Evreux,

and

and prince of the blood he had no right to negotiate with a foreign power without the privity of his lord paramount, yet name to me the great vassal of the crown who has not at one time or other entered into particular treaties with the neighbouring powers. In what respect therefore is Charles *the Bad* worse than many others? Would to God that this epithet were applicable only to him!

Some writers have pretended that he poisoned Charles V; but where is the proof of this? How easy it is to invent new crimes for those who are oppressed by the hatred of a party! We are told that he had engaged a Jew physician from Cyprus to come to poison the king of France. There are too many accounts, in our histories, of kings poisoned by Jew physicians; but a sickly constitution is far more dangerous than all the physicians.

XVI.

Of Religious Disputes.

WE have seen that from pope Gregory VII. to the emperor Charles V. the disputes between the empire and the priesthood were continually disturbing both. From the time of Charles V. till the peace of Westphalia, blood was continually shedding in Germany on account of religious disputes: the same evil desolated England from the reign of Henry VIII. to that of William III. when liberty of conscience was fully established.

France experienced, if it is possible, still greater misfortunes from the time of Francis II. to the death of Henry IV. and even this death, which will always make a deep impression on humane readers, was the result of those disputes. It is melancholy that so good a tree should have produced such detestable fruit.

It has been often disputed whether the emperor Henry IV. ought to have thrown off the papal yoke
instead

instead of waiting barefoot in Gregory the Seventh's antichamber; whether the emperor Charles V. after taking and sacking Rome ought to have reigned in that city and turned Protestant; and whether Henry IV. king of France could have dispensed with his act of abjuration. All sensible people agree that neither of these three things was possible.

The emperor Henry IV. had too strong a party against him, and besides, wanted talents to engage in a revolution: Charles V. had all the advantages the other wanted, but he would have gained nothing by renouncing the Catholic religion. As for Henry the Great, king of France, it is probable that he could not possibly follow any other method than that which he adopted, however humiliating it was to him. Queen Elizabeth who reproached him so bitterly for his abjuration, might indeed have assisted him in disputing the possession of a few provinces, but not in conquering the kingdom of France. Three-fourths of the country, Philip II. and the pope were against him; he was therefore obliged to submit. His natural disposition seems to have led him to this step as much as the dilemma to which he was reduced. A Charles XII. or a Gustavus Adolphus would have remained inflexible; but those heroes were soldiers rather than politicians; whereas Henry IV. with all his failings, was equally great in politics as in war. It seemed impossible for him to be king of France unless he embraced the Romish communion, in the same manner as it would be impossible at present to be king of Sweden or England without being a Protestant. Henry IV. was assassinated notwithstanding his abjuration, as Henry III. was in spite of his processions; this proves the insufficiency of politics when opposed to fanaticism.

It is by reason alone that we can subdue this monster. The only way to prevent men from being wicked and absurd is to enlighten them. In order to render fanaticism execrable, we have nothing more to do than to delineate it. Only those who are enemies to mankind will presume to say, "You enlighten men too much—
" You

"You take too much notice of their errors." But let me ask them, how can those errors be corrected without being pointed out? You will say, perhaps, that the times of James Clement the monk will never return again. I thought as you do in this respect; but we have since seen a Malagrida and a Damiens *. And this Damiens when he came to be examined, very unexpectedly told his judges, that what he had done was *for religion's sake* †; and afterwards when put to the torture he declared, "*That from what he had often heard said by the priests, he thought he was doing a meritorious work.*" ‡ It is evident therefore, that this horrid attempt originated from confessors. But it will be said perhaps, that such horrors do not happen every year. I will allow this; but at the same time I defy any one to shew me one instance of a single month since the days of Charlemagne, in which theological disputes have not been fatal to mankind.

XVII.

Of the Protestants, and the War of the Cevennes.

PROTESTANTISM becomes a considerable object in the history of the human mind. We have seen how the prejudices of opinion, whether true or false, have deluged the earth with blood during a series of ages. Some few protestants have reproached the author of the *Essay on the Manners of Nations* with having too often condemned them; and on the other hand several Catholics have accused him of being too favourable to the Protestants. These complaints prove that he has observed that just medium which is satisfactory only to persons of a moderate way of thinking.

It is but too true that in every age and country, in which a reformation has been attempted in religious

* See the *Age of Louis XIV.* V.

† See Damiens' Trial in 4to. page 4. V.

‡ Ibid. Page 405.

matters, the reformers have been persecuted and put to death. They who rose up against the church of Rome in Europe suffered martyrdom in as great number as the Christians of the second century when they opposed the religious ceremonies of the Roman empire. The primitive christians were true martyrs; whereas the first reformers, as we are told, were only false martyrs. It is certain however, that both the one and the other were put to death, and that both were the victims of their respective opinions. The Judges who condemned them proceeded on the same principles, by punishing those whom they considered as the enemies of all laws both human and divine. In both instances we may observe the same treatment, and the strong punishing the weak; so that in these respects there is no difference between the Roman senate and the council of Constance; and the persons condemned either by the one or the other suffered death with the same intrepidity. John Huss and Jerome of Prague behaved as magnanimously at the stake as St. Ignatius or St. Polycarpus. The only difference between them is the cause for which they suffered; and there is this difference between their judges, that the Romans were not bound by their religion to spare those who endeavoured to destroy their gods; whereas the Christians were taught by their divine Master not to persecute other Christians, their brethren, who adored the same God.

If the primitive Christians amongst the Romans, and the heretics among Christians in later times, were put to death from political motives; or if these executions were the effect of zeal; still the cause was in both instances the same. If the pagan persecutors were iniquitous, the Christian persecutors were equally so. These maxims are true, and it is right to display them for the good of mankind.

It is well known that those who stiled themselves protestants in France, were persecuted forty years before they revolted; for they did not take up arms till after the massacre of Vassy.

It must be acknowledged likewise that the war carried on by a savage populace in the Cevennes under Louis XIV. was the effect of persecution. The two parties are not agreed as to the origin of those scenes of horror. Some say that the abbé Chaila, who was at the head of the mission in Languedoc, was murdered in order to get a girl out of his hands; others, that it was to recover several children whom he had stolen from their parents in order to instruct them in the Catholic faith; both those causes might concur, but at any rate it is certain that violence first gave rise to the insurrection which occasioned so many shocking crimes and executions.

After the peace of Ryswick, several inhabitants of Languedoc went into the principality of Orange (which then belonged to Louis XIV.) in order to sing psalms and pray to God in their own jargon. In their way back an hundred and thirty of them, men and women, were seized and tied two and two together upon the road. Seventy of the most robust of them were sent to the galleys.

Not long after a preacher named Marlié was hanged for propagating the protestant religion, and his three sons were hanged at the same time for having been instrumental in collecting the people together on these occasions. Several families were fired upon in their way to those sermons: eighteen were killed in the diocese of Uzès, and three pregnant women being found among the dead, their bellies were ripped open in order to destroy the infants in their entrails. These pregnant women were indeed acting in opposition to the new edicts; but did not the primitive Christians do the same with respect to the edicts of the Roman emperors? We must either allow that the Roman judges did right to destroy the Christians, or that the Catholic judges did wrong to hang the protestants. The situation both of the protestants and the primitive Christians was precisely the same, and (we cannot repeat it too often) they were equally innocent or equally culpable.

In

In short, after the death of Maximinus, the Christians, whom he had persecuted, cut the throats of his infant son and daughter, and drowned his widow in the Orontes. The Protestants, who had been persecuted by the abbé Chaila, assassinated him. This it was that gave rise to the horrid war of the Cevennes. It is even impossible for a revolt to take place without a previous persecution. It is repugnant to human nature to suppose that the people will rebel and murder their magistrates, unless they are driven to extremity. Even Mahomet took up arms only with a view to defend himself, and perhaps there would be no such thing as Mahometanism at present in the world if the people of Mecca had not persecuted Mahomet.

In an *Essay on Manners*, it is impossible to enter into a detail of all the horrors that have desolated so many provinces. Human nature would appear in too odious a light if every thing was related that could be collected in this way.

It is right however to give a detail of our crimes in history, to the end that mankind may be deterred from repeating them. The proscriptions of Sylla and Octavius, for instance, are not equal to the massacre of the Cevennes, either for their number or their barbarity; it is true they are more celebrated, because the name of ancient Rome naturally makes a greater impression than that of the villages and hamlets of Anduze; and the names of Sylla, Anthony and Augustus are more striking than those of Ravanel and Castagnet. But during the six years the troubles in Languedoc continued, there was much more cruelty employed than during the three months proscriptions of the triumvirate. We may be convinced of this by the letters written in those melancholy times by the eloquent Flechier, at that time bishop of Nismes. In one of these, dated in 1704, we find the following passage: "Upwards of four thousand Catholics have been murdered in the country; eighty priests assassinated, and two hundred churches burnt." He is speaking only of his own diocese; others were exposed to similar calamities.

Never was there a scene of greater crimes, or of more horrid executions; and the two parties, sometimes assassinating and at others assassinated, both equally invoked the name of the Lord. In the *Age of Louis XIV.* we shall see upwards of four thousand fanatics perishing upon the wheel or at the stake; and what is very remarkable, there was not one who did not die blessing God, or who shewed the least weakness; men, women, children, all expired with the same courage.

If it be asked what occasioned this and the many other religious wars which have deluged Europe with blood? we may assign, as the only cause, the misfortune of having too long neglected morality for controversy. Authority has aimed at compelling men to believe, instead of ordering them to be just; and thus has furnished them with pretexts for being obstinate. Men will sacrifice their blood and their life, rather than their reason; (and it is much easier to lead an hundred thousand men to battle,) than it is to convince a single prejudiced person.

XVIII.

Of LAWS.

LAWS are the effect of opinion, and it has been sufficiently insinuated in the *Essay on the Manners, &c.* that they are almost every where uncertain, insufficient, and contradictory. And this is not merely because they are a human work; since geometry, which is a human invention, is true in all its parts; experimental philosophy is true likewise, and even the first principles of metaphysics, upon which geometry is founded, are incontestable; and none of all these things can vary. The reason why the laws are so variable and defective is, that almost all of them have been established to remove temporary evils, in the same manner as a medicine applied at random cures one patient and kills others.

Several kingdoms being composed of provinces that were originally independent, and these provinces having
been

been divided into districts that were not only independent of, but enemies to each other, their laws were consequently very different and are so still. What is true and right at one side of a river is frequently false and wrong at the other; so that in travelling through a country, a man finds a new system of laws every time he takes fresh horses.. In Brie the husbandman is independent of his lord: whereas in a certain part of Burgundy he is his vassal, and there the monks also are vassals. In some countries the laws are more uniform, but there is not one perhaps that does not stand in need of a reformation in this respect; and even were such a reformation to be effected another would soon be necessary. It is in a little state only, that a uniform system of laws can be established. We are sometimes able to succeed in the models of machines, which we cannot execute on a large scale.

In short, when we have brought our laws to a tolerable degree of perfection, there comes a war which ruins every thing, and we are then obliged to begin again like ants whose nest has been destroyed.

Nothing can be more disgraceful to the legislature of any state, than to be guided by laws that are not of that country. The reader may have observed how the divorce which was granted to Louis XII. king of France, by the incestuous pope Alexander VI. was refused to Henry VIII. king of England, by pope Clement VII. he may have seen likewise how pope Alexander VII. permitted Alphonso, regent of Portugal, to ravish his brother's wife, and to marry her while her husband was living.

Every thing therefore is contradictory; and we are rowing in a vessel that is incessantly tossed about by contrary winds.

It is observed, in *The Essay on the Manners of Nations*, that strictly speaking there is no such thing as a positive fundamental law; and that men can make only laws of convention. The eternal laws of nature could be the work only of a divine Author. "Do unto others

“others that which thou would have done unto thee,” is the only fundamental and immutable law subsisting among mankind. It is the law of nature herself, and cannot be rooted out of the human breast. Of all laws, it is perhaps that which is the least attended to; and yet it never fails to elevate its voice against him who transgresses. It would seem as if God had implanted it in man, as a counterpoise to the power of the strong over the weak, and to prevent mankind from exterminating each other by war, chicanery, and religious disputes.

XIX.

Of Commerce and Finances.

HOLLAND almost overflown by the sea, Genoa surrounded only by rocks, and Venice with no other territories than her lagunes, would have been nothing more than deserts, or rather would have had no existence, had it not been for their commerce.

It was this alone that made Venice a formidable power, so early as the fourteenth century, and that in our days, made Holland such likewise for a certain time.

What then must have been the condition of Spain under Philip II. who at once was master of Mexico and Peru, and whose establishments in Africa and Asia included about three thousand leagues of those coasts?

It is almost incredible, and yet it is well attested, that Spain alone, from the end of the fifteenth till the beginning of the eighteenth century, procured by her American commerce to the amount of five thousand million of piasters, in gold and silver, which are equal to twenty-five thousand millions of our livres. We have only to read Don Ustaris and Navaretta in order to be convinced of this astonishing fact. This is a much greater quantity of species than there was in the whole world together, before the voyage of Christopher Columbus. Every poor man of merit, who
knows

knows how to think, may make reflections on this subject. It may be some consolation to him to be told, that of all those immense treasures, there remain at present in Spain only about an hundred millions of piafters, and as much in gold and silver plate. What will he say when he reads in Don Uftaris, that the datary at Rome swallowed up a part of this treasure? He will think perhaps that modern Rome is richer than ancient Rome was in the days of Crassus and Lucullus. She has done, it is true, every thing she could to become so, but having never engaged in commerce, while almost all the other nations in Europe have enriched themselves in this way, she has lost, by her ignorance and indolence, all the treasure that has flowed into her datary, or that she fished so easily with St. Peter's nets.

Spain, at first, did not suffer other nations to share with her the treasures of America. Philip II. had it almost entirely to himself for several years; so that the other sovereigns of Europe, beginning with his uncle the emperor Ferdinand, were to him nearly what the Swifs were to the duke of Burgundy when they said to him, "All that we have is not worth the spurs of your knights."

Philip II. ought to have possessed what is called the universal monarchy, if it could have been purchased by gold or procured by intrigue. But a woman who was mistress only of half an island; a prince of Orange who was nothing more than a count of the empire, and a subject of the marquis of Mechlin; together with Henry IV. who was king only of a part of France, who was persecuted in the other part, who was in want of money, and whose whole resource consisted in a few gentlemen and his own personal courage; these three persons, I say, proved an overmatch for the lord of the two Indies.

Commerce, which had assumed a new form, after the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope and that of the new world, underwent a fresh change when the Dutch, after throwing off their yoke, made themselves masters of the spice islands and founded Batavia. Holland and
England

England were then the two great commercial powers. France, which is always late in profiting from the improvements and enterprizes of other nations, was the last that made any establishments either in the East or West Indies, and of course was the worst off. She remained inactive till the fine days of Louis XIV. who did every thing in his power to animate commerce.

The people of Europe at that time began to experience new wants, which rendered the commerce of some nations, and especially that of France, very disadvantageous. Henry IV. breakfasted with a glass of wine and some white bread; he drank neither tea, coffee nor chocolate; he took no snuff: his wife and his mistresses had but few jewels, and they wore no Persian, Chinese, or Indian stuffs. If the reader reflects that at present, the wife of a private citizen wears much finer diamonds in her ears, than Catharine de Medicis ever did; that Martinico, Mocho and China furnish the breakfast of a maid servant; and that for all these objects, France is every year drained of upwards of fifty millions of livres, he will readily perceive that other branches of commerce are requisite to repair this continual loss; and it is well known that France has supported herself by her wines, her brandies, her salt and her manufactures.

She stood in need of an East India Company, not to increase her riches, but to lessen her expences; for as mankind have created new wants, they who possess not the commodities which satisfy those wants, ought to purchase them at the easiest rate possible. Hence it is evident that what is procured at prime cost from India, must be less expensive than if resold by the Dutch or the English. Almost all these commodities are paid for in ready money. The only views that France could have in establishing an East India Company, were to lose less, and to endeavour to indemnify herself, in Germany and the north of Europe, for the immense sums she expended on the coast of Coromandel. But the Dutch had been before hand with the French in Germany as well as in India; and their frugality

frugality and industry gave them every superiority. The great inconvenience for a new European company which establishes itself in India, consists, as I have already observed, in its being the last comer. She finds powerful rivals who have gotten the trade into their own hands; she must put up with affronts from nabobs and omrahs, and must either bribe or fight them. Thus the Portuguese, and after them the Dutch, were unable to purchase pepper till they had fought several battles.

Whenever France is at war with England, or Holland, in Europe, the question is, which shall destroy the other in India. Commercial companies are then necessarily converted into military ones, and must either oppress or be oppressed. Thus we shall find that when Louis XIV. had established an East India company at Pondicherry, the Dutch took the town and ruined the company. It rose again out of its ruins, and proved that confusion may in some instances be productive of order. But neither vigilance nor the prudence of the directors, were able to prevent the English from taking Pondicherry, and the company from being almost entirely destroyed a second time. The English restored the place again at the peace; but in such a condition as might naturally be expected from a trading people jealous of a rival in their commerce. The company found her warehouses destroyed, so that she has now only a few ships, and has incurred debts which she has not money to discharge.

The company assumed a sovereign authority in India, but she found there other sovereigns, who were foreigners as well as herself, and more successful. It is certainly very extraordinary that the Great Mogul who is so powerful, should suffer European merchants to wage war against each other in his empire, and to lay waste some parts of it. If we were to give up Port l'Orient to the East Indians, and Bayonne to the Chinese, we should not allow them to fight each other in France.

With respect to finances, both France and England in consequence of their wars, have increased their national debt to upwards of three thousand millions of livres. There is not so much species in either of these kingdoms. The discovery of this secret of owing more than we possess, and of subsisting as if we owed nothing, may be considered as one of the greatest efforts of the human mind in the present century.

There is not a state in Europe that does not ruin itself after a seven or eight years war; and this is because they exert themselves more than their ordinary strength will allow. Kingdoms may be compared to individuals who run in debt to gratify their ambition; they are all of them desirous of doing more than they are able. It has been often asked, what is become of all those treasures, that have been expended in time of war; and the answer has been, that they are in the hands of two or three thousand individuals, who have profited by the misfortunes of the public. These two or three thousand persons enjoy their immense fortunes in peace, while the rest of their fellow subjects are groaning under a load of new taxes, in order to liquidate a part of the national debt.

England is the only country where individuals have been enriched by war; what the English have gained by privateering, and what their officers gained at the Havannah and in the East Indies, far exceed the quantity of species, that was circulating in England in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

When the fortunes of so many individuals are in the course of time diffused through the nation by marriages, &c. and above all by means of luxury which then becomes necessary, and serves to restore these hoards to the public; then this enormous disproportion ceases, and the circulation is about the same as it was before. In the same manner the treasures that have been concealed in Persia, during the civil wars with which that country has been afflicted for the space of forty years, will make their appearance again after a few years calm, and no
part

part of them will be lost to the nation. Such is the vicissitude attendant on all human things.

XX.

Of POPULATION.

IN a late History of France we are told, that at the time of Philip of Valois, there were eight millions of families in France; for by the word *feu*, is understood a family; and by the word *France*, the author means that kingdom, such as it is at present with its annexed territories. According to this account therefore, if we allow four persons to each family, the number of inhabitants must have amounted to thirty-two millions; for, one with another, we cannot reckon less than four persons to each family.

This calculation is founded on a state of the subsidy raised in 1328; which enumerates two millions, five hundred thousand families in the territories dependent on the crown, which were not more than one third of what the kingdom includes at present. It was therefore necessary to add two thirds more, in order to make the author's calculation a just one. The addition of these two-thirds, would make the whole amount only to seven million five hundred thousand, but if to this we add, five hundred thousand for the ecclesiastics, and other persons not included in the account, we shall then have the eight millions. The author reckons only three persons to each family; but according to the calculations I have made in different places, and upon my own estate, I allow four and a half to each.

Supposing therefore the population in 1328 to be exact, we must necessarily conclude, that France, considered in its present extent, contained at the time of Philip of Valois thirty-six millions of inhabitants; whereas according to the last inquiry that was made in this way in 1753, by the means of the *taille* and other taxes, it was found to contain only three millions, five hundred thousand, four hundred and eighty-nine families,

lies, which at the rate of four persons and a half to each, amount only to fifteen million, nine hundred and seventy-seven thousand, and two hundred inhabitants. To this number we must add the ecclesiastics, and about seven hundred thousand persons at least, whom we may suppose to be in Paris, and who were not included in the account. Whatever mode of calculation we may adopt, whether reckoning three, four or five persons to a family, it is clear that the number of inhabitants is lessened more than one half since the time of Philip of Valois.

It is now about four hundred years since the enumeration was made under Philip of Valois ; we may suppose therefore that in four hundred years more, the number of inhabitants in France will be reduced to one quarter, and in eight hundred years to one eighth; so that eight hundred years hence, there will be only about four millions, and at the expiration of nine thousand two hundred years, there will be only a single person and a fraction remaining. The fate of other nations in this respect will doubtless be the same, and the world will then be at an end.

All that I can say as a consolation to mankind on this occasion is, that in two estates with which I ought to be well acquainted, and which were erected into fiefs at the time of king Charles V. I find half as many more families than are enumerated in the deed of feoffment, although there was a considerable emigration from these estates at the revocation of the edict of Nantes.

The human race neither diminishes nor increases in number so much as hath been commonly supposed; and it is probable that they were much mistaken at the time of Philip of Valois when they reckoned two million five hundred thousand families in his dominions.

I have always thought that France at present contains about twenty millions ; and I have reckoned, one with another, five persons to a family. I find that I agree in this calculation with the author of the *Tenth* (*Dixieme*), a work attributed to Marshal de Vauban ; and likewise

with the account given in by the intendants of the several provinces at the close of the last century. If I am mistaken it can only be in about four millions, and this is a mere trifle with authors.

Hubner in his Geography computes the number of inhabitants in Europe at thirty millions only. He may easily have been mistaken in about an hundred millions. A calculator, who in other respects is pretty exact, assures us that China contains only seventy-two millions; but according to the latest and best account, which is that given us by Father du Halde, these seventy-two millions are reckoned exclusive of the old men, the women, and the young persons who are under twenty years of age, so that the total of inhabitants must be more than double that number.

We must acknowledge that in general we people and unpeople the earth by mere chance. All the world acts in this manner; it is hardly possible for us to have an exact notion of things; the *nearly so* † is our guide, and this guide often deceives us.

The case is still worse when we wish to have an exact calculation. We go to see farces and to laugh at them; but is it less laughable to see grave authors calculating with great nicety how many persons there were in the world two hundred and eighty five years after the deluge? Father Petau, a Jesuit, assures us that the family of Noah in the space of three hundred years had produced 2,247,284,117,000 inhabitants. The good Father Petau neither knew what it was to get children or to bring them up. What a rate he goes on at!

According to Cumberland the same family produced only 3,300,000,000 souls in the space of three hundred and forty years; and Whiston has calculated that about three hundred years after the deluge there were only 65,000,536 persons in the world.

It is difficult to admit either of these calculations. They only serve to shew the weakness of mankind in attempting to reconcile what is irreconcilable, and to explain things that are inexplicable. These unhappy

* *L'a peu-près.*

projects have disordered many a brain that might otherwise have been useful to the world.

The authors of an universal history published in England observe, "That it is generally agreed that the world contains at present four thousand millions of inhabitants." You will be pleased to take notice that these gentlemen do not include America in their calculation; and we know that America comprehends almost half of the globe. They likewise tell us, that the human race increases to double its number in the space of four hundred years. This calculation contradicts the account given us at the time of Philip of Valois, according to which, the nation has diminished more than half in that space of time.

For my own part, if instead of adopting the romantic notions of former writers on this subject, I were inclined to calculate how many brethren I have upon this unhappy little globe, I would proceed in the following manner: I would first see how many square leagues of habitable earth there are upon the surface of the globe; I would say, the surface of the globe affords twenty seven million square leagues, but let us allow at least two-thirds of this space for seas, rivers, lakes, deserts, mountains and other parts that are uninhabited; this calculation, which is a very moderate one, would leave us nine million square leagues to reckon upon.

In France and Germany they reckon six hundred inhabitants to every square league, in Spain an hundred and sixty, in Russia fifteen, in Tartary ten, in China about a thousand; suppose we were to fix upon one hundred as a medium. This would make the number of our brethren, whether whites, negroes, or copper coloured, red, or yellow, with beards or without, to amount to nine hundred millions. It is hardly credible however that the earth should contain so great a number of inhabitants; and if we continue to make eunuchs, to increase the number of monks, and to make war with each other on the slightest occasion, I leave you to judge whether there will be even the four millions which the English authors of the Universal history have so liberally granted.

granted. After all, of what consequence is it whether the number of persons in the world be many or few? The most essential thing is, that the human species be as little unhappy as possible.

XXI.

Of the Scarcity of good Books, and the enormous Multitude of bad ones.

THERE were few historical writers before the sixteenth century, but since that period their number is immense. In Le Long's catalogue we find seventeen thousand, four hundred and eighty seven works which have some relation to the history of France. Some of these works consist of more than an hundred volumes. It is now about forty years since this catalogue was printed, and it is well known what a prodigious number of books have appeared since that time on this subject.

It is nearly the same thing in Germany, England and Italy. We lose ourselves in the immensity; fortunately the greater part of these books are not worthy of being read, any more than the little things they contain were deserving of being written. Amidst this immense number of histories we find but too many romances similar to those of Gassien de Courtils. Secret histories written by persons who were never in any secret, are pretty numerous; but the authors who have undertaken to govern the state without stirring from off their chairs are still more so: among these last we may reckon those who have taken the pains to compose the testaments of princes and statesmen. Thus we have had the testaments of marshal Belleisle, cardinal Alberoni, the duke of Lorraine, the two ministers Colbert and Louvois, marshal Vauban, cardinal Mazarin and cardinal Richelieu. The public were for a long time deceived in regard to the Testament of Cardinal Richelieu. The book was considered as excellent, because it was supposed to be the work of a great minister. There are but few men who have time to read with attention.

Hardly

Hardly any-body was at the trouble to examine the mistakes, the anachronisms, the indecencies, the contradictions, and the absurdities with which the work is filled. They who read it did not take notice, that the book was not printed till upwards of forty years after the cardinal's death, and that it was signed in a manner very different from the cardinal's mode of signature. They forgot that Auberi, who was employed by the cardinal's niece to write her uncle's life, considered the testament as a forgery, as a book unworthy of his hero, and unworthy of all belief. Auberi was at the source of information, he had all the cardinal's papers in his possession, and there certainly cannot be a stronger testimony than his.

The learned abbé Richar author of the Miscellanies, de Vigneul, de Marville, Charles Ancillon and La Monnoye were all of the same opinion.

In a chapter, entitled of *printed lies*, the reader will find all the reasons that ought to convince him that this political testament is the work of a forgerer.

How was it possible, in fact, that such a minister as cardinal Richelieu, should have left so important a legacy to Louis XIII. without its being presented by some of the cardinal's family to that monarch, without its being deposited in the archives, without its being talked of, or in short, without any body's having the least knowledge of it? Is it possible that a prime minister, could leave a plan of conduct for his sovereign, and yet in all this plan not say a word of the affairs, in which that prince and the rest of Europe were at that time the most interested; not a syllable about the house of Austria with whom he was then at war; nothing concerning the duke of Weimar, or the situation of the Calvinists in France, or in a word, nothing concerning the education which it would be right to give the dauphin?

It appears evidently that this pretended testament was written after the peace of Munster, since it speaks of that peace as being concluded, whereas the cardinal died during the war.

I shall

I shall not repeat here all the reasons that have been already alledged, with a view to vindicate cardinal Richelieu from the imputation of so bad a work.

It is right that the most probable opinions should be opposed, because by this means they are placed in a clearer light. All the arguments of a sensible and judicious writer, who some few years ago thought fit to attack our opinion on this subject, amounted only to this, "I am of opinion that the plan is the cardinal's, but that it is possible and even probable, that he neither wrote nor dictated the work."

If he neither wrote it nor dictated it, it is certainly not his; and he who signed it with the name of cardinal Richelieu was no better than a forger. We will have no more to say to it; if any one has a mind to be deceived by it, let him.

XXII.

QUESTIONS on HISTORY.

I.

DOES not the history of every nation begin with fables? And are not these fables the invention of idleness, superstition and interest? What is related by Herodotus of the first kings of Egypt and Babylon; what is told of Romulus and Remus and their she wolf; what the first barbarous writers of our own country have invented concerning Pharamond and Childeric, and a certain Bazina wife to one Bazin of Thuringia, and a Roman captain named Giles, who was elected king of France before there was a France, and a crown cut in two, one half of which was sent to Childeric, to make him come back from Thuringia, &c. &c. &c. &c. are not all these fables, I say, the invention of idleness?

Are not all the fables concerning oracles, divinations and prodigies, the fruit of superstition?

VOL. IV. *Gen. Hist.*

Y y

And

And were not all the fables concerning the donation of Constantine to pope Sylvester, the false decretals, and the last law of the Theodosian code, dictated by interest?

2.

It is asked, what emperor instituted the seven electors? I reply, that no emperor created them. Were they created then by the pope? By no means. The pope could have no more right to do this than the Dalai Lama. By whom then were they instituted? By themselves. They are the seven principal officers of the imperial crown, who in the thirteenth century arrogated to themselves this privilege, which all the princes neglected. Thus it is that the generality of privileges are established; they are confirmed by laws and by time, until other laws and other times abolish them.

3.

It is asked, why the cardinals, who were at first nothing more than the curates of Rome, should after a time fancy themselves superior to the electors, and other princes of the empire, and equal to kings? This is like asking why mankind are inconsistent? I find, in several histories of Germany, that when the dauphin of France, who was afterwards Charles V. repaired to Metz to implore the assistance of the emperor Charles IV. he yielded precedence to the cardinal d'Alba, who was bishop of Perigord and rear-vassal to the king his father; I say rear-vassal, because the English were at that time in possession of Perigord. This cardinal walked before the dauphin at the diet of Metz, where the second part of the golden bull was promulgated; and was the only person allowed to eat at the same table with the emperor, *ob reverentiam pontificis*, as Triteme says in his Chronicle of the Monastery of Irfaugen. This proves that princes ought seldom to travel beyond the limits of their own country, and that a
cardinal

cardinal legate was at that time at least the third person in the universe, and fancied himself the second.

4.

Much has been written concerning the Salic law, the peerage, and the privileges of parliament; and there is still something appearing every day on these subjects. This sufficiently proves that the origin of all these, as of many other things, is very obscure. Custom stands in the stead of every thing, till at length it is sometimes obliged to yield to superior power. Every one considers his ancient privileges as so many sacred rights; but if in these days the Chatelet* at Paris, were to hang a beadle of the university for a highway robbery, would this same university find herself authorized to insist on the provost's digging up the body of the beadle, asking pardon of the deceased and of the university, and kissing the mouth of the former and paying a fine to the latter, as was done at the time of Charles VI. in 1408?

Would she likewise be authorized to seize on the *lieutenant-civil* or deputy provost, and give him a whipping, with his breeches down, in the public schools, and in the presence of all the students, as was the case at the time of Philip Augustus?

5.

When was it that the parliament of Paris began to take cognizance of the king's revenue; this office having been originally annexed to the chamber of accounts? In what year did the barons, who distributed justice in the parliament of Paris, first discontinue their attendance and give up their places to the lawyers?

* The *Chatelet* is a court of justice under the jurisdiction of the provost or chief magistrate of Paris. T.

6.

Are not all the customs of France derived originally from Italy and Germany? And is not the consecration of the kings of France, evidently an imitation of the consecration of the kings of Lombardy?

7.

Is there a single ecclesiastical custom in France that does not originate from Italy? And were not the feudal laws brought to us by the northern nations who subdued Gaul and Italy? Some persons pretend that the festival of fools, the festival of the as, and other such like absurdities are of French origin; but these are not ecclesiastical customs, they are only the abuses of some few churches; and besides, the festival of the as originated at Verona, where they preserved the as that came there from Jerusalem.

8.

Has not every species of industry made a very slow progress in France? (And from the invention of cards, (which from their names, as spadille, manille, &c. are evidently of Spanish original) to that of the compass, and air pump, is there a single art for which she is not indebted to other countries? Have not arts, opinions and customs made the tower of the globe?

HISTORICAL

HISTORICAL OBSERVATIONS

OCCASIONED BY

A SCANDALOUS LIBEL

ON THE

ESSAY ON THE MANNERS AND SPIRIT
OF NATIONS.

WHERE there is question only of taste we do well not to answer any body, because there is no disputing about taste; but in historical matters and in the discussion of interesting facts, we should answer the vilest of mankind. On such occasions our contempt of the libel ought to give way to the interests of truth. The following observations therefore, are an appeal to the few who study history, and who have a right to be judges. One Nonotte*, an Ex-Jesuit, of sufficient learning for the pulpit, and polite enough for a college, took it into his head to publish a large work entitled *The Errors of the Author*; and this undertaking was the more extraordinary, as this Nonotte had never studied history. In order therefore to make it sell he filled it with absurdities, some of which were superstitious and others abusive.

Nonotte's first Absurdity.

THE libeller accuses the author of the *Essay on the Manners of Nations* of having said, "The ignorance of Christians represents Dioclesian as an enemy incessantly armed against the faithful."

* See *The Historical Commentary*, &c. page 92.

There

There is no such expression in the text as, "The ignorance of Christians." In all the editions we read, "Ignorance usually represents Dioclesian." This sufficiently shews how a word more or less changes truth into an odious falsehood.

Second Absurdity.

THE author of *the Essay on the Manners of Nations*, speaking of a Christian who publickly tore in pieces the imperial edict, stiles him *indiscreet*. The libeller justifies him and says, "was not such an edict evidently unjust?"

In answer to this we may observe, that such an argument is too much in favour of maxims that have so often been condemned by all our parliaments, who declare that however unjust a royal edict may appear to the subject, he is nevertheless guilty of high treason if he publickly tears it, and tramples it under his feet. The author of the libel ought to know that it is right to respect the sovereign and the laws.

If Nonotte had to do with a certain learned person, the latter would say to him, "Sir, you are either very ignorant or very knavish: you say in your pious libel (page 20) that it was not the first, but the second edict of Dioclesian that was publickly torn by a Christian of distinguished quality.

"In the first place it is of very little consequence whether this Christian was of the highest quality or not. Secondly, if he was really of high rank he was only the more culpable. Thirdly, Fleuri in his Ecclesiastical History (vol. ii. page 128) says in express terms, that the edict publickly torn by this Christian of distinguished rank, in contempt of the victories gained by the Romans over the Goths and Sarmatians, and which were mentioned in it, was the first edict by which the Christians were deprived only of their honours and dignities."

"If you have read Eusebius, from whom Fleuri has taken this fact, you are a rascal for falsifying this passage

" passage in order to calumniate me. If you have not
 " read him you are an ignorant fellow, and I may ven-
 " ture to add very impudent, for attempting to write
 " about things you are unacquainted with."

In an age like the present, however, we should hardly venture to make use of such language.

Third Absurdity

A CENTURION named Marcel, in a review near Tangier in Mauritania threw away his belt and his arms and cried out, " I will no longer serve either the emperors or their Gods." The author of the libel commends this action, and finds fault with the author of the *Essay on the Manners of Nations* for saying that the zeal of this centurion was by no means prudent; as it happens there is not a word about this matter in that *Essay*; it is in another work that it is spoken of. I would ask however whether a captain who happens to be a calvinist would do right to throw away his sword at a review and say, " I will no longer fight for the king and the Virgin Mary." It would surely be more prudent in him to quit the service quietly.

Fourth Absurdity, concerning St. Romanus.

OUR libeller thinks it very impious to deny the adventure of the young St. Romanus. There is no mention of this saint in the *Essay on the Manners of Nations*, but here is what is said about him in the *Literary and Historical Miscellanies*.

" It is very probable that the grief of the Christians, though well founded, might break out in exaggerated complaints. We are told in a work entitled the *Sin- cere Acts*, that while the emperor was at Antioch, the prætor having condemned a Christian child named Romanus to be burnt to death; certain Jews who were present were so wicked as to laugh, and to say to each other, ' we had formerly three little children, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who escaped alive out of the burning furnace, and yet this child burns;'

“ burns;’ at that instant, to confound the Jews, the fire
 “ was extinguished by a heavy shower of rain, and the
 “ little boy came out unhurt, asking, ‘ what is become
 “ of the fire?’ The *Sincere Acts* add, that the emperor
 “ caused him to be set at liberty, but that the judge
 “ ordered his tongue to be cut out. It is hardly possible
 “ that a judge should order the little boy’s tongue to
 “ be cut out after the emperor had pardoned him.

“ What follows is still more singular. They pre-
 “ tend that an old Christian physician named Arifton,
 “ who stood ready with his bistoury, cut out the child’s
 “ tongue in order to make his court to the prætor.
 “ Young Romanus was immediately sent back to pri-
 “ son; and the gaoler asking him what had passed, the
 “ child immediately told him how an old physician
 “ had cut out his tongue. It is right to observe that
 “ the little boy used to stammer greatly before this
 “ operation, whereas he now spoke with wonderful
 “ fluency. The gaoler did not fail to give an account
 “ of this miracle to the emperor. The old physician
 “ being sent for, swore that the operation had been per-
 “ formed in a proper manner, and shewed the child’s
 “ tongue which he preserved in a box. ‘ Bring me the
 “ first person that happens to go by, said he, I will
 “ cut his tongue out in your majesty’s presence, and you
 “ shall see whether he will speak or not;’ accordingly
 “ a poor man being brought in, the physician cut off
 “ just as much of his tongue as he had done of the
 “ child’s; and the man died upon the spot.”

I am willing to believe that the *Acts*, which relate this fact, are as *sincere* as their title expresses them to be; but their singularity is certainly greater than their sincerity.

The judicious reader is now to determine whether it is not allowable to doubt a little in regard to this miracle. The author of the libel may likewise, if he pleases, believe in the appearance of the *Labarum*, but he ought not to abuse those who are not of the same opinion.

Fifth

T
 mann
 which
 was c
 of St.
 to dr
 where
 a larg
 cious
 ture.
 Euc
 two hu
 this he
 bishop
 Vol

Fifth Absurdity, concerning the Emperor Julian.

PEOPLE may indulge themselves in invectives against the emperor Julian, but it is certain that he was a man of the best morals: we may lament that he was not a Christian, but we ought not to censure him. Here is what he wrote to the Alexandrians concerning the murder of bishop George, the great persecutor of the Athanasians: "Instead of referring the consideration of your injuries to me, you have given yourselves up to passion, and have not been ashamed to commit the same excesses as those which rendered your adventures so odious to you." Julian here reproves them as an emperor and a father. Let the reader peruse his other letters and he will be convinced, there never was a person of more prudence and good sense. What! because he had the misfortune not to be a Christian, shall we deprive him of every virtue? Are Cicero, Virgil, the Cato's, the Antoninuses, Pythagoras, Zaleucus, Socrates, Plato, Epictetus, Lycurgus, Solon, and Aristides, who were the wisest of men, to be considered as monsters because they were not of our religion?

Sixth Absurdity, concerning the Theban Legion.

THE author of the libel endeavours in a very droll manner to vindicate the fable of the Theban Legion, which was composed entirely of Christians, and which was compleatly surrounded in a narrow pass at the foot of St. Bernard's mountain, where it would be impossible to draw up three hundred men in battle array, and where two hundred men would be sufficient to oppose a large army. Here are the proofs given by our judicious critic to confirm the authenticity of this adventure.

Eucherius, says he (who by the bye relates this history two hundred years after it happened) *was rich*, and in this he says truth. *Eucherius had heard it related by Isaac*

bishop of Geneva, who without doubt was rich likewise.

VOL. IV. *Gen. Hist.*

Z z

Isaac

Isaac had the story from a bishop named Theodore, who lived an hundred years after the massacre. These to be sure are mathematical proofs. I request Nonotte to go in person to St. Bernard's mountain, and see with his own eyes whether it could be possible to surround and massacre an entire legion there; we may add that this legion is said to have been on their way back from the East, and St. Bernard's mountain was certainly far out of their direct road from thence. We may add likewise, that this fable, which is so famous in all the legends, was invented by Gregory of Tours who attributed it to Eucherius, who died in 454; and it is observable, that in this legend, supposed to have been written in 454, much is said of the death of one Sigismond king of Burgundy, who was killed in 523.

It may be of some use to inform the ignorant impostors of the present age, that the time is over with them, and that the assertions of such wretches are no longer credited.

Somebody advised Nonotte to marry the six thousand soldiers of the Theban legion to the eleven thousand virgins; but the poor Ex-Jesuit was not able to do this.

Seventh Absurdity, concerning Ammianus Marcellinus.

NONOTTE, in page 48 of his libel, has the following passage, "Ammianus Marcellinus does in no part of his work say, *that he had seen the Christians tear one another to pieces like wild beasts.* The author of the *Essay on the Manners of Nations* therefore believes at once both Ammianus Marcellinus and the Christians."

Tell me, Nonotte, which of the two is the slanderer, you or the author of the *Essay on the Manners of Nations*? In the first place your quotation is erroneous, for it is said in the *Essay* that Ammianus Marcellinus tells us, "*That the Christians in his time tore one another like wild beasts;*" not that he *had seen* them himself. Secondly, here are the words of Marcellinus as they stand in p. 223, of the edition published by Henry of Valois. *His effertis hominum mentibus iram in Georgium episcopum verterunt, viperiis morsibus ab eo sæpius appetiti.* I

would ask the libellist what is the characteristic of vipers? Is it mildness or fierceness? Besides, is the testimony of Ammianus Marcellinus necessary for us to be convinced that the Eusebians and Athanasians behaved towards each other with the most detestable fury? How long will the spirit of persecution and falsehood continue to prevail?

Eighth Absurdity, concerning Charlemagne.

NONOTTE accuses the author of the *Essay on the Manners of Nations* of having said that Charlemagne was only a successful plunderer. This libeller often asserts what is not true. The historian styles Charlemagne, "The most ambitious, the most politic, and "the greatest warrior of his age." It is true that Charlemagne caused four thousand five hundred prisoners to be put to death in one day. I would ask the libellist whether he would like to have been one of St. Charlemagne's prisoners?

Ninth Absurdity, concerning the Kings of France who were Bigamists.

NONOTTE, speaking of Charlemagne (page 75) asserts that neither of the kings Gontran, Cherebert, Sigibert, or Chilperic had more than one wife at a time.

This defamatory writer does not know that Gontran was married at one and the same time to Veneranda, Mercatruda, and Ostregila; that Sigibert married Brunehaut while his first wife was living; that Cherebert had three wives at a time, Merofleda, Marcovefe, and Theodegilde; and, in short, that Dagobert had likewise three wives, and yet is said to have been a pious prince, having given a great deal to monasteries. It is necessary to inform Nonotte that his brother Jesuir, Daniel, tho' a very indifferent historian, yet is honest and more attached to truth than him. Daniel ingenuously acknowledges, in his first volume, that the great

Theodebert married the beautiful Deuteria, although he had another wife living at the time, named Vifigalde, and Deuteria had another husband; and that in this respect he imitated his uncle Clotharius, who married his brother Clodomir's widow, although he had already three wives.

The result of all this is, that Nonotte is excessively ignorant, and excessively impudent.

Tenth Absurdity, concerning more serious Matters.

No, Ex-Jesuit Nonotte, no, persecution was not in the disposition of the Romans. All religions were tolerated at Rome, although the senate did not adopt all the gods of other countries. The Jews had a synagogue at Rome. The superstitious Egyptians, a people as contemptible as the Jews, had erected a temple there which would not have been demolished, had it not been for the adventure of Mundus and Paulina. The Romans, those masters of the world, never engaged in controversy; they thought only of conquering and civilizing nations. It is not possible they could ever punish any person merely for religion's sake. That they were a just people is sufficiently proved by the *Acts of the Apostles*, in which we are told that St. Paul, having by the advice of St. James entered the temple of Jerusalem, seven days successively, in order to purify himself, and to persuade the Jews that he had observed the law of Moses; those people requested Festus the proconsul to put him to death; upon which Festus said to them, "It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused, have the accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him *."

It was by the order of a Sadducee, and not of a Roman, that St. James, the brother of Jesus, was stoned to death. It is therefore very probable that the impla-

* Acts, chap, xxv,

cable hatred, which men generally conceive towards those who separate themselves from their communion, occasioned the martyrdom of the primitive Christians. I shall speak of this elsewhere; but at present, libeller, I will not say a word to you about it. I will only recommend it to you to study history philosophically if you can.

Nonotte's Eleventh Absurdity, concerning the Mass.

NONOTTE pretends that the mass was the same at the time of Charlemagne, as it is at present. He wants to deceive us; there was no private mass at that time, and this is what is meant. Mass was originally a supper. The faithful met together on the third floor, as appears from several passages of scripture, and especially from the 9th verse, of the 20th chapter of the *Acts of the Apostles**. They broke the bread together, according to the words, "This do in remembrance of me †." Afterwards the hour was changed, and the assembly was held in the morning and called *sinaxe*, till the Latins gave it the appellation of *messe*. There was only one assembly, one *sinaxe*, one mass in each church, and the expression of *my brethren*, which is so often repeated, sufficiently proves that there were no private masses: they were not introduced before the tenth century. The ex-jesuit Nonotte is not even acquainted with the mass.

Twelfth Absurdity, concerning Confession.

THE author of the libel says that auricular confession was established in the earliest days of Christianity. He mistakes auricular for public confession. I will here give a faithful history of confession. The igno-

* "And there sat in the window a certain young man named Eutychus, being fallen into a deep sleep; and as Paul was long preaching, he sunk down with sleep, and fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead."

† Luke xxii. 19.

rance and falshood of critics are sometimes the means of unfolding the truth.

The confession of crimes, considered, as a mode of expiation, and as a religious act, was admitted time immemorial in all the mysteries of Isis, Orpheus and Mitras. The Jews were no strangers to these kinds of expiation, although in their law every thing was temporal. There was no mention made of punishments after death, either in the Ten Commandments, or in Deuteronomy, or Leviticus; nor do either of these say any thing of the immortality of the soul. But in later times, the Essenians adopted the custom of acknowledging their faults publicly in their assemblies, and the other Jews contented themselves with asking pardon of God in the temple. On the day of annual expiation the high-priest entered alone into the sanctuary, asked pardon for the people, and loaded a goat named *hazazel* (an Egyptian word) with the sins of the nation. It was customary in all religions for the people to offer up victims, and to wash themselves with pure water as an expiation of their sins. Hence these famous verses;

*O faciles nimium qui tristia crimina cedis,
Fluminea tolli posse putatis aqua.*

St. James in his General Epistle, says "Confess your faults one to another*," and the primitive Christians established this custom as a restraint on their actions; but the most holy institutions are frequently mistaken and abused.

Sozomenes informs us in the sixteenth chapter of his seventh book, that the bishops being sensible of the inconveniencies of these public confessions, performed as upon a theatre, appointed in each church a single priest of a devout and prudent character, who was called the penitentiary, and before whom sinners confessed their faults, either singly or in the presence of others of the faithful. This custom was established about the year

250.

* Chap. v. 16.

The

The scandalous affair that happened at Constantinople at the time of the emperor Theodosius I. is well known. A woman of quality accused herself to the penitentiary, of having lain with the dean of the cathedral. This woman must necessarily have made this confession publicly, since the dean was deposed, and the affair made a great noise. It was then that the patriarch Nectarius abolished the office of penitentiary, and allowed every one to participate of the mysteries without any previous confession. Both Socrates and Sozomenes inform us, that "Every person was at liberty to receive the sacrament if his conscience would permit him so to do."

John Chrysostome, who succeeded Nectarius, strongly recommends it to us to confess ourselves to God: in his fifth homily he expresses himself as follows: "I exhort you to confess your sins to God; I do not mean that you should do it publicly; I do not constrain you to discover your sins to mankind; display your conscience before God, shew him your wounds, and beseech him to heal them; acknowledge your faults to him who upbraids you not with them, to him who knows them all, and from whom you cannot conceal them."

And again in his homily on the fiftieth psalm, he says, "What! shall I recommend it to you to confess yourselves to a man, to an equal, who may reproach you on account of your faults? No, I say unto you, confess yourselves to God."

Fifty other similar and equally authentic passages might be quoted in support of this doctrine, which has been succeeded by the holy and useful custom of auricular confession. Nonotte knows nothing of all this.

Thirteenth Absurdity, concerning Berenger.

THE article relating to Berenger is very curious. "The author of *The Essay on the Manners of Nations*—says Nonotte—seems not to know the Catholic cate-

"chism

“chism, but to be well acquainted with that of the Calvinists.”

In reply we may assure him that the author is well versed in both those catechisms; and well knows that both condemn ignorant fellows who say abusive things without wit.

I pass over every thing this honest man says concerning the Eucharist, because I respect that mystery as much as I despise his calumny. There are some things so sacred and delicate, that we ought neither to dispute about them with knaves, nor speak of them before fanatics.

Nonotte's Fourteenth Absurdity, concerning the Second Council of Nicea, and Images.

WE shall not attempt to refute what the libeller says concerning the second council of Nicea, the council of Frankfort, and the Caroline books. It is well known that the Caroline books, which were sent to Rome and not condemned, speak of the second council of Nicea as *an arrogant and impertinent synod*: these facts are attested by the most authentic testimonies. The council of Frankfort rejected the adoration of images, and would not allow even the slightest use to be made of them in churches.

It is pleasant to hear the author of the libel accusing the historian of being a Calvinist, because the historian is an accurate relater of facts.

The worship of images is due solely to ecclesiastical discipline. It is certain that neither Jesus Christ, nor any of his Apostles, ever made use of images. It is possible that St. Luke who was a painter, might paint a portrait of the Virgin Mary, but we do not find that any such portrait was ever worshipped. Images and statues are noble ornaments when they are well executed, provided no occult virtues or ridiculous powers are attributed to them; they are revered by pious souls, and esteemed by persons of taste: We may say all this without being Calvinists. We may even laugh at the picture of St. Ignatius which used to be displayed at the

Jesuits

Jesuits College at Paris. In that picture, the saint was represented ascending to heaven in a coach drawn by four white horses. The Jesuits would now find it difficult to introduce this picture into any of the churches at Paris.

Fifteenth Absurdity, concerning the Crusades.

THE author of the libel shews his good sense in the praises he bestows on the enterprize of the crusades, and on the manner in which they were conducted; but he will give us leave to doubt whether the Mahometans would willingly have chosen for their sultan a Christian prince who was their mortal enemy and their prisoner, and who was acquainted neither with their customs nor their language.

The author of the *Essay on the Manners of Nations* says, that Constantinople was taken for the first time by the Franks in 1204, and that before that period no foreign nation had ever made themselves masters of that city. The author of the libel calls this truth a gross error, and pretends that several emperors had returned victorious into Constantinople after seditions. But what relation, I beseech you, could those seditions have to the translation of the Greek empire to the Latins?

Sixteenth Absurdity, concerning the Albigenes.

THE article concerning the Albigenes is one of those in which the author of the libel displays the greatest ignorance and enthusiasm. It is certain that the crimes imputed to the Albigenes were such as are not in human nature. They were accused of holding secret assemblies, in which the men and women mixed together indiscriminately, after putting out the light. It is well known that similar horrors were imputed to the primitive Christians, as they have been to all who have attempted to become reformers. They were likewise accused of being Manicheans altho' they had never heard of the name of *Manés*.

The unfortunate Raymond V. count of Toulouse, against whom a crusade was undertaken, in order to deprive him of his territories, was very far from adopting the errors of these poor Albigenſes. There is ſtill extant a letter written by him to the abbot and chapter of Citeaux, in which he complains of the heretics, and requeſts aſſiſtance. This is a ſtriking example of the improper power the monks at that time in had France; ſince we thus ſee a ſovereign prince obliged to apply for protection to an abbot of Citeaux. He obtained the ſuccour he had ſo imprudently demanded. The abbot of Clervaux, who had been raiſed to the purple, and appointed legate by the pope, marched at the head of an army to aſſiſt the count of Toulouse; and the firſt ſuccour he afforded him, was by laying waſte Beziers and Cahors, in 1187. The country was expoſed to all the horrors of excommunication and war, till the year 1207, when the count of Toulouse began to repent that he had called legates into his province, who murdered and plundered his ſubjects inſtead of converting them.

A monk of Citeaux, named Peter Caſtelnaud, who was one of the pope's legates, was aſſaſſinated by ſome perſon unknown; and the ſuſpicion fell upon the count of Toulouse, although there was not the leaſt proof of his guilt. The biſhop of Rome then did to him what he had ſo often done to almoſt all the princes of Europe; he gave the count's territories (to which he had no more pretenſions than to China or Japan) to the perſon who ſhould ſeize firſt on them; and thus a crusade was undertaken againſt this deſcendant of Charlemagne, in order to revenge the death of a monk.

The pope ordered all thoſe who had been guilty of any deadly ſin, to engage in the crusade, offering them the pardon of their ſins on this condition only; and declaring them excommunicated if they would not aſſiſt in laying waſte Languedoc with fire and ſword. The duke of Burgundy, the counts of Nevers, St. Pol, Auxerre, Geneva, Poictiers, and Forez, together with upwards of an hundred lords of caſtles, the archbiſhops

shops of Sens and Rouen, and the bishops of Clermont, Nevers, Bayeux, Lisieux and Chartres assembled, as it is said, near two hundred thousand men, in order to gain pardons and spoils.

All this gives us an idea of the most irregular kind of government, or rather of the most execrable anarchy.

The count of Toulouse did all he could to divert the storm. That unfortunate prince had the weakness to give up to the pope seven castles which he was possessed of in Provence. He then repaired to Valence, where he appeared before the pope's legate, naked to the waist, barefooted, and having on only a pair of drawers; in this condition, he was whipped at the door of St. Giles's Church, like a criminal who is whipped by the executioner, and in order to complete his disgrace, he engaged to perform a crusade against his own subjects. It would be needless to repeat the rest of this deplorable revolution; it is well known how many towns were reduced to ashes, and what an infinite number of families were destroyed by fire and the sword.

In the sixth chapter of the history of the Albigenes, we are told that the clergy chaunted the hymn of *veni sancte spiritus*, at the gates of Carcassonne, while the troops were butchering all the inhabitants of the suburbs, without any distinction of age or sex; and yet we now find a gentleman who dares to canonize those abominations, and to print a book at Avignon, to prove that it is right to treat princes and nations in this manner, in the name of God! we cannot but acknowledge that this man is extremely mild and indulgent.

After having shuddered at the recital of so many horrors, it will perhaps be of no use to enquire whether the counts of Foix, Comminges and Bearn, (who joined with the king of Arragon, in fighting for the count of Toulouse, against the bloody Montfort,) were heretics; the libeller declares them to have been such; perhaps this matter has been revealed to him from above. After all, however, there does not seem to have been any thing heretical in their taking arms in favour of an injured prince. It is true that they were

excommunicated, according to the absurd and horrid custom of those times, but who told this gentleman that those noblemen were heretics.

Let him repeat as often as he pleases, that God operated a miracle in favour of the count of Montfort; there are but few people in the present age who will believe that God changes the course of nature, and works miracles in order to spill human blood,

Seventeenth Absurdity, concerning the Changes made in the Church.

NONOTTE imagines we have been wanting in respect to the Catholic church, in relating the different forms it has taken.

Is there any one so ignorant, as not to know that all the customs of the Christian church have changed since the time of Jesus Christ? The necessity of the times, the increase of the flock, and the prudence of the pastors, have introduced or abolished laws and customs. Almost all the customs of the Greek and Latin churches differ. At first there were no temples, and Origenes says, that the Christians admit neither temples nor altars. Many of the primitive Christians were circumcised, and the greater number of them abstained from the use of pork. The *consubstantiality* of God and his son, was not publicly established, nor was even the word *consubstantial* known before the first council of Nicea. Mary was first declared to be the mother of God by the council of Ephesus, in 431; and Jesus Christ was not clearly allowed to have two natures, till the council of Chalcedonia, in 451; two wills were not admitted till long afterwards, by the council of Constantinople, in 680. The whole church was without images during a period of near three hundred years; during six hundred years, the sacrament was administered to little children; almost all the fathers of the first centuries expected the millenium. It was for a long time an universal belief, that all children who died without being baptized, were condemned to flames everlasting.

everlasting. St. Augustine declares this in express terms; *parvulos non regeneratos ad eternam mortem**. It was not till after the time of Charlemagne, that the church of Rome first admitted that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the father and the son.

All the fathers of the church, and all the councils till the twelfth century, were of opinion that the Virgin Mary was conceived in original sin; and at present, this opinion is adopted only by the Dominicans.

There is not the slightest appearance of the invocation of saints, before the year 375. It is evident therefore, that the wisdom of the church has varied her creed, her ceremonies and customs, according to the difference of times and places. Every wise government has done the same.

The author of *the Essay on the Manners of Nations* has related, in an impartial manner, all the different changes for which the church has been indebted to her pastors. These changes, it is true, have been productive of schisms, much blood has been spilt, and mankind have been greatly troubled for the sake of their opinions; let us thank God therefore that we were not born in those melancholy times. Happy it is for us, that we are now a days troubled only with libels.

Eighteenth Absurdity, concerning the Maid of Orleans.

LET the charitable Nonotte continue to insult the ashes of John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, this is an action worthy of his character; and let him endeavour to persuade us, that Joan of Arc was an inspired person, and that God sent this girl to the assistance of Charles VII. against Henry VI. this may make us laugh: but it is necessary to contradict the false account he gives of her trial. This trial is to be found in *Rymer's Fœdera*.

Being interrogated in 1431, she declared that she was then twenty-nine years of age; she was therefore twenty-seven, when she went to see the king in 1429: this

* See chap. xiii. of his book *De Perseverantia*, V.

proves

proves the libeller to be a very indifferent calculator, as he asserts that she was then only nineteen years of age.

It will be necessary to inform the reader concerning the real history of this Joan of Arc, commonly called the Maid of Orleans. The particulars of her adventures are but little known, and may be entertaining to the generality of readers.

Paul Jovius, says, that the courage of the French was animated by this girl, but he is far from supposing her to have been inspired. Neither Robert Gagain, nor Paulus Emilius, nor Polydore Vergil, nor Genebrar, nor Philip de Bergame, nor Papirius Masson, nor even Mariana pretend that she was sent by God; and even if Mariana the Jesuit had said it, his assertion would have had no weight with me.

Mezerai believes that *the prince of the heavenly forces appeared to her*; I am sorry for Mezerai, and ask pardon of the prince of the heavenly forces for not being of the same opinion.

The generality of our historians, who copy after one another, suppose that the Maid of Orleans prophesied events and afterwards fulfilled them. They make her say, that she will drive the English out of the kingdom; and yet the English continued in France five years after her death. They make her write a long letter to the king of England, although it is certain that she could neither read nor write: it was not customary to teach the maid servants of inns such things in those days, and we find it mentioned in the trial that she could not sign her name.

They likewise tell us, that she found a rusty sword, upon the blade of which were engraven five flower de lucas; and that this sword lay hid in the church of St. Catherine at Tours. This was certainly a great miracle.

The poor Maid of Orleans having at length been taken by the English, in spite of her prophecies and miracles, asserted, in the presence of her judges, that St. Catherine and St. Margaret had honoured her with many revelations. I am surprized that she said nothing
about

about her conversations with the prince of the heavenly forces. It is probable that these two saints were fonder of talking than St. Michael. Her judges supposed her to be a witch, and she fancied herself inspired.

As a proof that Charles the Seventh's officers employed the marvellous, as an encouragement to their soldiers in the deplorable state to which France was reduced, we may observe that Saintraille had his shepherd, in the same manner as the count de Dunois had his shepherdes. The shepherd foretold things in favour of one party, while the shepherdes did the same for the other.

But unfortunately the count's prophetess was taken by one of Vendome's bastards, at the siege of Compiègne, and Saintraille's prophet was taken by lord Talbot. The brave Talbot was not cruel enough to order the shepherd to be burnt; he was one of those true Englishmen, who despise superstition of every kind, and who are too philosophical to punish fanatics.

This, in my opinion, is what historians ought to have attended to, although they have wholly neglected it.

The Maid of Orleans was conducted to John of Luxembourg count of Ligny. She was at first confined in the castle of Beaulieu, afterwards in that of Beaurevoir, and lastly in that of Crotoy in Picardy.

Peter Cauchon, bishop of Beauvais, who sided with the king of England, against his lawful sovereign, claimed the Maid of Orleans as a witch, who had been arrested within the limits of his diocese. He insisted on trying her as a witch, and supported his pretended right by a remarkable falshood. Joan had been taken in the bishop of Noyon's diocese, and neither he or the bishop of Beauvais, had certainly the least right to condemn any person, and much less to deliver into the hands of the executioner, one who was a subject of the duke of Lorraine, and in the pay of the king of France.

There was at that time (who would have thought it?) a vicar-general of the inquisition in France, who was called brother Martin. This was one of the most horrid

rid effects of the total subversion of that unhappy country. Brother Martin claimed the prisoner as *smelling heresy, odorantem hæresim*. He summoned the duke of Burgundy and the count de Ligny, "By the privilege of his office, and the authority invested in him by the holy see, to deliver up Joan of Arc to the holy inquisition."

The Sorbonne, being impatient to second brother Martin, wrote to the duke of Burgundy and John of Luxembourg in the following terms: "You have exerted your whole power, in apprehending this woman who calls herself *the Virgin*, through whose means the honour of God has been offended without measure, religion excessively wounded, and the church greatly dishonoured; having occasioned idolatry, errors, bad doctrine, and other inestimable evils to spread themselves in this kingdom. But it would be to little purpose to have made such a capture, unless there should follow what is required to satisfy the offence, by her perpetrated, against our holy creator, his faith and his holy church, together with her other innumerable misdeeds. It would therefore be an intolerable offence against the divine majesty if this woman were to be set at liberty."

At length Joan was adjudged to Peter Cauchon, who was called the base bishop, the base Frenchman and the base man. John of Luxembourg, sold *the Virgin* to Cauchon and the English for ten thousand livres, and the duke of Bedford paid the money. The Sorbonne, the bishop, and brother Martin, then presented another petition to the duke of Bedford Regent of France, praying that, "For the honour of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the said Joan might speedily be put into the hands of ecclesiastical justice." Joan was conducted to Rouen. The archbishoprick of that city was at that time vacant, and the chapter permitted the bishop of Beauvais to officiate on the occasion. He chose for his assistants nine doctors of the Sorbonne, with thirty-five other persons who were either abbots or monks. Brother Martin presided with Cauchon, but

as he was only vicar of the inquisition he had only the second place.

The interrogatories were fourteen in number, and are all of them singular; Joan asserted that she had seen St. Catherine and St. Margaret at Poitiers. Beaupere, one of the doctors, asked her by what token she knew the saints? Joan replied that it was from the manner in which they curtsied. Beaupere then asked her whether they were very talkative? Go, said she, and look into the register. Beaupere then inquired if St. Michael was naked when he appeared to her? Joan replied, do you think that our Lord had not wherewithal to cover him?

This is the ridiculous part of the affair, here follows the horrible part. One of her judges, who was a doctor of divinity and a priest, named Nicholas L'Oiseleur, came to confess her in prison. He applied the sacrament to the most scandalous purpose, by concealing two priests behind a curtain in the prison, who wrote down the prisoner's confession. Thus the judges were guilty of sacrilege in order to palliate this murder. And an unhappy idiot, who had been courageous enough to do great service to her king and country, was condemned to the flames by forty-four French priests who made this sacrifice to the English faction.

It is well known how they had the meanness to place mens cloaths in her prison, in order to tempt her to resume that dress, and with what absurd barbarity they made this pretended transgression a pretext for condemning her to the flames, as if in this warlike young woman, the putting on breeches instead of petticoats, was a crime for which she deserved to be burnt. The whole narrative greatly affects the heart, and makes common sense shudder. It is difficult to conceive how, after the innumerable horrors of which we have been guilty, we can dare to give to any other people the appellation of barbarians.

The greater part of our historians, who seem more attached to the pretended embellishments of history than to truth, tell us that Joan shewed great intrepidity

at the place of execution; but the chronicles of that time mention, and Mr. de Villaret acknowledges, that she shed tears and cried much when sentence was passed on her; a weakness excusable in her sex and perhaps in ours, and very compatible with the courage which this young woman had displayed amidst the dangers of war; for a person may be bold and daring in the field, and yet deeply affected upon the scaffold.

It seems right to add here, that several persons, without being at the pains to make inquiry, have believed that the Maid of Orleans was not burnt at Rouen, although the account of her trial is still extant. They have been deceived by the account which has been published of an adventurer, who assumed the name of *the Maid of Orleans*, and even imposed upon Joan of Arc's brother, and by means of this deception was married to a gentleman of Lorraine, of the family of Armoise. There were two other impostors who pretended they were the Maid of Orleans; all these asserted that some other woman had been burnt instead of Joan of Arc. Such idle stories, however, can be credited only by those who are willing to be deceived.

Learn, Nonotte, how necessary it is to study history before we presume to speak about it.

Nineteenth Absurdity, concerning Rapin de Thoyras.

NONOTTE, page 185, attacks the accurate and judicious Rapin de Thoyras, and says it neither suited his taste, nor was safe for him, to write in favour of the Maid of Orleans. Nonotte, knows but little of the laws of England. It is certain, that in that country an author is at full liberty to write any thing he pleases: but it is worthy of observation, that the gentleman whom the libeller insults in this manner, did not compose his history in England, but at Wezel, where he died:

We will here make one more observation, on the miraculous adventure of Joan of Arc, and this is, that it must have been a droll miracle, to send a young girl

to assist the French against the English, in order to have her burnt afterwards.

Twentieth Absurdity, concerning Mahomet II. and the taking of Constantinople.

THE author of the libel revives the story of Mahomet II. who beheaded his mistress Irene in order to please his janizaries. This story is sufficiently refuted by the Turkish annals, and by the manners of the seraglio which have never suffered the secrets of the sultan's bed to be exposed to the military.

He denies that one half of the city of Constantiople was taken by capitulation; but the Turkish annals compiled by prince Cantemir, and the Greek churches that still subsist, are sufficient proofs that Nonotte knows no more of the Turkish history than of ours.

Twenty-first Absurdity, concerning the Tax upon Sins.

THE author of the libel asks, "Where is this disgraceful licence, this scandalous tax, those prices fixed on sin, which were established into a law?" Let him read *The Taxes of the Roman Chancery*, printed at Rome in 1514 by Marcellus Silbert, the year following at Cologne by Gosvinus Colinius, and lastly, at Paris in 1520, by Tonsaint Denys, in St. James's street. He will find the following clause in the first article, *de causis matrimonialibus*. "In causis matrimonialibus, pro contractu quarti gradus, taxa est turonenses septem, ducatus unus. carlini sex."

Must we be obliged to inform this poor man, that in the 18th article, absolution is given to any one who has had carnal knowledge of his mother, on payment of five crowns; a father and mother who have killed their son, are taxed only five ducats; and sodomy or bestiality are rated only at nine ducats. After such proofs the libeller ought either to hold his tongue, or to pay for his sins.

Twenty-second Absurdity, concerning the Right of the Laity to confess.

NONOTTE asks where the author learnt that laymen, and even women had a right to confess? If he looks into the writings of St. Thomas d'Aquinas, page 255, part III. of the edition printed at Lyons, in 1738, he will find the following passage, "*Confessio & defectu sacerdotis a laico facta sacramentalis est quodam modo.*" Need he be told how many abbesses used to confess their nuns? We cannot do better than transcribe part of a letter written by a very learned man, which is dated at Valence, February 1st, 1769, and relates to a custom of which Nonotte seems to be perfectly ignorant.

The libeller asks "whether we can mention any abbesses who ever confessed her nuns?"

To this therefore we shall reply, by the following quotation from the Abbé Fleury's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. xvi, page 246. "In Spain there were abbesses who gave their nuns the benediction, heard them confess, and who likewise preached in public. This fact appears from a letter written by pope Innocent III. and dated December 10th, 1210."

To these remarks of that learned writer, I shall add the authority of St. Basil, who in his *Abridged Rules*, vol. ii. page 453, observes, that "it is allowable for an abbess to hear the confessions of her nuns." I shall add farther, that father Martene in his *Ceremonies of the Church*, vol. ii. page 39, affirms that the abbesses were for a long time permitted to confess their nuns, but that at length they were found to be so inquisitive, that it was judged necessary to deprive them of this privilege. We shall have occasion to take notice again of Nonotte's ignorance in regard to confession, in another article.

Nonotte's

Nonotte's Twenty-third Absurdity.

THE author of the libel speaking of Calvinism, pretends that the historian seems to be too partial to Calvin and Luther. It is right he should know that the author of the *Essay on the Manners of Nations* respects only the truth; that he has loudly condemned the murder of Servetus, and that he detests persecution and fanaticism, wherever he finds them. The device of this work is, *Iliacos intra muros peccatur et extra.*

Nonotte's Twenty-fourth Absurdity, concerning Francis I.

THE author of the libel carries the spirit of persecution so far, as to repeat the following speech imputed to Francis I. by Florimond de Raymond, and since so eagerly quoted by the Jesuit Daniel. "If any one of my children were to differ from the opinions of the church of Rome, I would sacrifice him with my own hand." This is what Nonotte calls a *tender piety*. Is it possible that Francis I. who allowed Barbarossa to have a mosque in France, could have been pious enough to cut the dauphin's throat, if the dauphin had thought proper to pray to God in French, or to use bread and wine in the sacrament? Is it possible I say that Francis I. could be induced to utter so barbarous an expression? Neither de Thou nor Duhaillan make mention of it, and even if they had, and it were true, what could we say of it, but that Francis I. must have been an unnatural father, or that he did not think as he spoke.

Nonotte's Twenty-fifth Absurdity, concerning the Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

WRETCH! has the author of the apology for the massacre of St. Bartholomew, assisted you in your libel? It would seem as if you wanted to palliate the murders of that night. You say, they were never premeditated; but if you read Mezerai, you will find him

him acknowledging in the fifth volume of the Amsterdam edition, that "from the end of the year 1570, "they persevered in the grand design of drawing the "Huguenots into the snare." Does not your brother Daniel say, that Charles IX. performed his part well? And has not he copied this expression from the historiographer Matthieu? God knows, it was a horrid part, and we find it but too well authenticated.

A critic who falls into mistake, is contemptible only, but a man who would attempt to excuse the massacre of St. Bartholomew, must be a rascal deserving of punishment.

Nonotte's Twenty-sixth Absurdity, concerning the Duke of Guise, and the Day of the Barricades.

HERE are the words of Nonotte, "as to the order "sent by Henry III. to the duke of Guise, forbidding "him to come to Paris, the author of *the Essay on the "Manners of Nations*, says, that the king was obliged "to write to him by the post, because he had no money "to pay a courier."

Wretched libeller! learn to quote more correctly. The words of the text are, "he wrote two letters to "him, and ordered them to be delivered by two couriers. Even for this necessary expence, there was no "money in the treasury: the letters were sent by the "post; and the duke came to Paris, alledging, as a "specious excuse, that he had not received the orders."

If you now wish to be informed where this anecdote is to be met with, I will refer you to Never's Memoirs, and l'Etoile's Journal. You stile the latter of these an obscure citizen, whereas it is well known that l'Etoile was of an ancient and noble family; but whether he was a citizen or not, here are his words, page 95, vol. ii.

"A negociation however was set on foot at Soissons, "between the duke of Guise and Bellievre, who within "three days, was to bring him securities on the part "of the king. Some other more pressing affair prevented Bellievre from going to finish this commission;

"never-

“ nevertheless, he wrote to the duke of Guise, to inform him of the cause of the delay, but the treasury refused to give him five and twenty crowns to pay the two couriers who were to go to Soissons, so that the two packets were sent by the post, and arrived too late, because the duke of Guise being intreated by the leaguers to go to Paris, set out from Soissons at the expiration of three days.”

Nonotte's Twenty-seventh Absurdity, concerning the pretended Execution of Mary of Arragon.

IT is useful to refute all the ridiculous stories with which the romantic writers, whether monks or lay-men, have deluged the middle ages. One Geoffry of Viterbo took it into his head at the end of the twelfth century, to write such a kind of chronicle as it was usual to write in those days. In this chronicle he relates that the emperor Otho III. having espoused Mary of Arragon, that empress fell in love with a count of Modena, who refusing her offers, Mary accused him to the emperor of having attempted her honour? that the emperor caused the count to be beheaded; that the count's widow came with her husband's head in her hand, to demand justice, and to prove his innocence; that the widow insisted on being put to the trial of hot irons; that she walked over the irons without feeling them, whereas the empress burnt the soles of her feet, upon which the emperor caused the latter to be put to death.

This fable resembles all the other legends of those barbarous ages. At the time of Otho III. there was neither a kingdom of Arragon, nor a Mary of Arragon, nor a count of Modena; and yet we see this and other similar falsehoods eagerly copied by an hundred authors; the Maimbours adopt it, and the Lenglets repeat it in their universal chronology, together with the battle of the serpents, and the adventure of an archbishop of Mentz, who was devoured by rats. All these fables are made to be credited by our libeller, but not by sensible people.

Nonotte's

Nonotte's Twenty-eight Absurdity, concerning Pepin's Donation.

YES, we persist in our opinion, that neither Pepin nor Charlemagne disposed of the sovereignty of Rome, or of the exarchate of Ravenna, 1. because, if the donation had really been made, the popes would have preserved the authentic instrument of it; 2. because Charlemagne in his will mentions Rome and Ravenna among the towns that belonged to him. This seems decisive. 3. Because the Otho's, who marched into Italy, never acknowledged this donation, and that under Otho, the popes had no sovereignty. 4. Because Pepin could not possibly give away places to which he had no right or pretension. 5. Because the Greek emperors never complained of this pretended donation, either by their ambassadors or in their treaties. To all this may be objected, a passage in Eginhardus, who says, that Pepin offered the Pentapolis to St. Peter; but this means only, that he put it under the protection of St. Peter, in the same manner as Louis XI. afterwards gave the county of Boulogne to the Virgin Mary. The popes had many estates in Italy, but they were not sovereigns either under Pepin or Charlemagne, who had the supreme power.

It is not true that the popes were masters of the exarchate from the time of Pepin, to that of Otho III. The latter assigned the revenues of the Marquisate of Ancona, but not the sovereignty, to the holy see. This was the true origin of the temporal power of the see of Rome. It began towards the close of the tenth century, but was not firmly established till the time of pope Alexander VI.

Nonotte's Twenty-ninth Absurdity, concerning a Fact relative to Henry III. King of France.

DEFAMATORY writer, you tell us, "You have never been able to find in what book it is said that Henry III. besieged Livron in Dauphiny." You pretend

pretend that it never was besieged, because it is now only a small place without any fortifications; but are there not many instances of cities changed into villages by the misfortunes of the times? Look into Mezerai's Chronological Abridgment, page 218; consult De Serres, or the 58th book of the accurate De Thou, and you will find that the city of Livron was besieged by Bellegarde, under the orders of the Dauphin of Auvergne; that Henry III. went in person to the camp, and that the besieged reproached him from their walls with the massacre of St. Bartholomew. You will find the whole of this adventure related in the *Collection of Memorable Events*, page 537; you will find it likewise in L'Etoile's *Memoirs*, vol. i. page 117. You will learn that it was not Montbrun who commanded in Livron, but Roeffes who was killed in an assault. You will learn that at the approach of the besiegers on the 13th of January, the inhabitants cried out from the walls, "Come on, murderers as you are; you will not find us asleep as you did the admiral." You will find that the women fought in the breach, and that this was a very memorable siege. In a word, you will learn that it is not for a college pedant to talk about the History of France when he knows nothing about it.

Nonotte's Thirtieth Absurdity, concerning the Conversion of Henry IV.

IT is dishonesty in Father Daniel, and stupidity in Nonotte, to pretend that Henry IV. had been a catholic in his heart, long before his conversion. But was it possible that the lover of Gabriella d'Estrees, who speaks to her of the *dangerous leap* he is about to take; the man whom the popes had declared to be a *detestable bastard*, and unworthy of wearing the crown; the politician who informed queen Elizabeth of his motives for changing his religion; the hero who had seen an hundred catholic assassins attempting to take away his life; the protestant who had written to Corisanda d'Andouin, "And you are of this religion! I had much rather turn

VOL. IV. *Gen. Hist.* C c c "Turk

"*Turk*"^{*}; or the monarch to whom Roni had said, "It is necessary that you should be a papist, and that I continue a protestant." Is it possible, I say, that such a man could sincerely believe the Roman catholic to be the only true religion? That it is such there can be no doubt, but is it likely that he should have faith in it while its ministers were every where preaching against him, while they introduced the following into their public Form of Prayer: "Lord, deliver us from the Bearnese † and the devil;" and in short, while they painted him in the shape of a devil with horns and a tail?

This great man, who was so basely persecuted, and whose courage was at length obliged to submit to the laws of his enemies, would never condescend however to sign the confession of faith which, after many disputes, was drawn up by David du Perron in the form in which we find it in the Memoirs of the Duke of Sully, who caused many minutiae to be suppressed. Henry IV. contented himself with ordering Lomenie to sign it.

The writer of a vain panegyric, might represent this hero as a convert to the catholic faith, but an historian ought to speak the truth; Father Daniel has not done this; and we find him speaking more advantageously of brother Coton, than of the greatest king that ever reigned in France.

We excuse his ignorance, when he stiles Lognac, one of the persons who assassinated the duke of Guise, *first gentleman of the bed-chamber*; we pass over his having never heard any thing of the famous assembly of the states in 1355; we shrug up our shoulders when he tells us, that Louis VIII. in his last illness, was advised by his physicians to take a young girl into bed to him, as the only means of saving his life, and that he preferred

* See the *Essay on the Manners and Spirit of Nations*, vol. iv, page 34. where the reader will find several very interesting letters from Henry IV. to Corisanda d'Andouin. V.

† Henry IV. used frequently to be called *Le Bearnais*, or the Bearnese, from Bearn, the place of his nativity. T.

death to a recovery by such a remedy, he, who by the bye, had one ready at hand in his wife, who was the finest princess in Europe. We are disgusted at finding him so ignorant of the laws, and are wearied with his confused descriptions of battles; but when we see him describing Henry IV. as a devotee, and as one who acted the part of an informer against the protestants to the republic of Venice, our disgust is mixed with indignation.

Nonotte's Thirty-first Absurdity, concerning Cardinal du Perron, and the States of 1614.

THE libeller affords us an opportunity of considering a very important question. All the memoirs of those times inform us, that cardinal du Perron opposed the publication of the fundamental law relative to the independence of the crown; that he caused the decree of parliament, which had confirmed this natural and positive law to be suppressed; that he caballed, and threatened, and said publicly, that if a king was an Arian, or Mahometan, it would be right to depose him.

No; it would be right to obey him if he had the misfortune to be a Mahometan, as much as if he were a holy Christian. The primitive Christians did not revolt against the Pagan emperors; what right then should we have to revolt against our Mussulman sovereign? The Greeks, who have sworn fidelity to the Padicha, would surely be criminal were they to violate their oath; and that which is a crime at Constantinople, is assuredly not a virtue at Paris. If we were to suppose (what is not impossible) that the king, to whom Du Perron had sworn allegiance, had embraced Mahometanism, and Du Perron had attempted to depose him, we must allow that Du Perron would have deserved death.

We will not say what the libeller deserves; but this opinion, that the church is empowered to depose kings, is of all opinions, the most absurd and the most deserving of punishment; and they who first brought it to light were monsters, and enemies to the human race.

31/10/20

26
31/10/20

The libeller asks, where Du Perron's words are to be found? Where? In all the memoirs of that period, in Le Vassor's collection, in the Jesuit d'Avrigni's Chronological History, and in short, every where.

Nonotte's Thirty-second Absurdity, concerning the State of Population in England.

SIR William Petty has proved, that the most favourable circumstances are requisite for a nation to increase a twentieth part in the space of an hundred years; and this calculation exposes the absurdity of those writers who people the earth by a stroke of their pen, and who in a century or two cover the globe with inhabitants. The libeller asks, "How England has acquired a third more inhabitants since the reign of queen Elizabeth?" We may answer him by saying, that it is because the most favourable circumstances have concurred to render it thus populous; because Germans, Flemings, and French have repaired in crowds to that country; because sixty thousand monks, ten thousand nuns, and ten thousand secular priests have been restored to the state, and to propagation, and lastly, because population has been encouraged by the liberty and affluence that prevail there. What has happened in England is quite the contrary of what we observe in the ecclesiastical state and in Portugal. He who manages his farm yard ill will be in want of poultry; he who manages it well will have a prodigious quantity. As for you, goose, who have written against these useful truths, may the farm yard in which you have been fattened, at the expence of the state, be in future filled only with useful poultry,

Nonotte's Thirty-third Absurdity, concerning Admiral Drake.

YOU pretend to be a man of learning, Nonotte; you say, that admiral Drake discovered the land of Jesso. Learn that Drake never visited Japan, much less the land of Jesso. Learn that he died in 1596, in his way

way to Porto Bello. Learn that the first discovery of Jesso was by the Dutch in 1644, forty-eight years after Drake's death. Learn likewise that the name of the discoverer was Martin Jeritson. Do you think to do any credit to your theology by acting the seaman? You shew your stupidity both by land and by sea, and you applaud yourself on account of your work, because your errors are in two volumes.

Nonotte's Thirty-fourth Absurdity, concerning auricular Confession.

IN good truth, Nonotte, you are as ignorant of theology as you are of sea affairs. The author of *the Essay on the Manners of Nations* has observed that according to St. Thomas d'Aquinas, it was allowable to confess to a layman in cases of necessity, and that confession is *not altogether a sacrament but a kind of sacrament*. In reply to this, you assert that all the critics agree that no such passage is to be met with in St. Thomas; and in return, I assert that no true critic will say any such thing. I defy you to produce an edition of St. Thomas's *Summa Theologiae*, in which this passage is not to be found. This performance was held in such high veneration, that no one would have presumed to have intermixed with it the work of any other writer. It was one of the first books printed at Rome so early as the year 1474, and in 1484 it was printed at Venice. It was only in the edition published at Lyons, that doubts were started whether or not the third part of the *Summa* was really written by d'Aquinas. But it is easy to discover in it his style and manner of writing.

St. Thomas d'Aquinas, however, did nothing more than collect the opinions of his time, and we have many other proofs that laymen were allowed to confess to each other; witness the famous passage in Joinville, where he tells us that he confessed a knight in Africa, and gave him absolution. A Jesuit ought at least to know what is said by the Jesuit Tolet in his work *de Instructione Sacerdotale*, book i. chap. 16. where he says, "*Nec femina*

fœmina nec laicus absolvere possunt sine privilegio", i. e. neither woman nor layman can give absolution without a license. The pope therefore can give the girls leave to confess the men.

We must here remind Nonotte, that this custom of reciprocal confession is of very ancient date. He will be greatly surprized, when he is told that it comes from Syria; he will find likewise that the Jews used to confess to one another upon certain occasions, and to give each other nine and thirty strokes with a whip upon their posteriors, repeating at the same time a verse of the 77th Psalm.

It would be proper for Nonotte to confess in the same manner, all the ill-natured absurdities of which he is guilty.

We could make more than an hundred similar remarks; but it is necessary to keep within bounds.

ADDITIONAL

ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS

ON A

L I B E L,

ENTITLED,

THE ERRORS OF M. DE V——.

BY M. D A M I L A V I L E

THE author of *The Essay on the Manners and Spirit of Nations*, condescended to refute the errors contained in the libel on that Essay, but neglected every thing that was personal in it with respect to himself; friendship and equity therefore induce me to add, what M. de V—— has disdained to say.

The author of the libel in the 20th, 21st, and 22d pages of his Preliminary Discourse, points out four contradictions, *of which*, says he, *M. de V—— has been guilty, without reckoning an infinite number of others*, which by the bye he does not specify.

Without doubt those he has quoted are the best supported; doubtless the illustrious journalist who has so highly applauded the criticisms of this libeller, has convinced himself they are judicious and has compared the quotations with the original, so as to be assured of their accuracy. This is what we are going to inquire into.

The first of these contradictions relates to the establishment of Christianity; the second, to the different species of mankind; the third to Michael Servetus; and the fourth and last to Cromwell.

We

We shall endeavour to ascertain the honesty, sagacity and civility of these gentlemen.

I.

*Of the Establishment of Christianity.**First Falsity of the Libeller, Absurdity of his Reasonings.*

‘IT is truly astonishing, says he in the 19th page of his preliminary discourse, that M. de Voltaire with his extensive genius, his vast erudition, and his prodigious memory, should have fallen into such evident contradictions. In the 5th chapter of his *Essay on the Manners of Nations*,’ he tells us, “That it was never the disposition of the Roman senate or of the emperors, to persecute any man on account of his religion; that the Christian church was at full liberty to extend itself even in the beginning, and that it was openly protected by several emperors.”

‘And in his *Age of Louis XIV.* continues the libeller, in the chapter on Calvinism, he says, that “This same church from the very beginning despised the authority of the emperors, holding her assemblies, in spite of their edicts, in grottoes and subterraneous caves, till Constantine drew it from under ground in order to place it at the side of the throne.”

It would be as astonishing to see M. de Voltaire expressing himself in this manner, as it is to see so much ignorance joined to so much falshood.

Is it in order to affront M. de Voltaire the more, that the author thus mutilates his style? Fortunately no person can possibly mistake it, and the reader will perceive the falsity of these quotations, the moment he reads them.

M. de Voltaire has not said, “That the Christian church was at full liberty to extend itself even in the beginning;” it is well enough known that this is not his manner of writing; here is the first passage as we find it in the original.

“Never

"Never did any of the Cæsars, or the pro-consuls, or the Roman senate, wish to hinder the Jews from believing their law. This reason is sufficient to shew the liberty Christianity had to extend itself in private."

Exclusive of the changes the libeller has thought fit to make in this passage, we may perceive that he has suppressed the words "*in private*," as being no way favourable to the forced and contrary sense he has endeavoured to give it, by means of the spurious and insipid expressions he has substituted in lieu of the original ones. This is the first proof of the accuracy of this honest compiler.

It is the same with respect to the second passage. He has thought proper to make M. de Voltaire say, "*subterraneous caves*;" but M. de Voltaire well knows there is no occasion to inform his readers that caves are *subterraneous*.

But supposing these two passages to be such as he has quoted them, where does this admirable critic discover the contradictions he complains of, and which his apologist applauds.

Is it not certain, Mr. Ex-Jesuit, that Christianity was not persecuted before the reign of Domitian? Will you not allow, that notwithstanding this, an infant religion, which opposes every other, does not immediately overturn the altars, nor begins with extending itself in public?

Fear, and even prudence, obliged the primitive Christians to hold their assemblies in secret; they were not persecuted, nor were they even rigorously sought after; but there were laws existing by which these meetings were prohibited, therefore they acted in defiance of those laws. We have a similar instance in France, where the wisdom of the government begins at length to tolerate the Calvinists; but will you deny that those people expose themselves to the severity of the laws that were enacted against them, and are still unrepealed?

M. de Voltaire in inquiring how a religion of peace and charity had produced those religious wars of which we have no instance in any other religion, did right therefore to say in his Age of Louis XIV, " Might we
 " not discover the source of this pestilence, which has
 " desolated the earth, in the republican spirit that ani-
 " mated the primitive Christians who assembled secretly
 " in grottos and caves, and thus bid defiance to the au-
 " thority of the Roman emperors."

Nor does this contradict what is said elsewhere in the fifth chapter of *the Essay on the Manners of Nations*, concerning the liberty the Christian church had to extend itself *in secret* under the emperors who preceded Domitian. The single expression, "*in secret*," is sufficient to remove every appearance of contradiction in the two passages, because in fact, altho' the Christians were tolerated, and were at liberty to cultivate and extend their religion in secret, yet they were acting in opposition to the laws, by which their meetings were prohibited; and consequently, they did this even under the emperors who protected them, until the reign of Constantine, who abolished those laws, and made Christianity the established religion.

After this explanation, give me leave to put some few questions to Mr. Ex-Jesuit and his apologist. Have the Christians never dared the authority of the sovereign, except at the time when their meetings were prohibited? To say nothing of an infinite number of other instances, give me leave to ask you whether the Christians of the league, who at the instigation of their patron, waged war against Henry III. and Henry IV; or the wretch, who the moment he had received the sacrament, came to assassinate his master; or the monsters who raised their sacrilegious hands against the greatest and best king upon earth; and who, in order to please God, deprived him of life, in the midst of a people to whom he was a father? let me ask you, I say, whether these were dutiful subjects? Will you deem it contra-
 dictory,

dict
 thos
 in p
 tear
 " C
 " b
 It
 favo
 ask
 " an
 know
 it wa
 in th
 such
 who
 Bu
 Can
 huma
 Than
 claim
 of th
 them
 whom
 contin
 efforts
 their
 to the
 which
 in you

Second

" M
 Essay
 " Hu

dictory, if I say, that under those princes, whose authority they opposed, they enjoyed the greatest liberty.

Will you say of those furious Christians what you say in page 20 of your first volume, of him who dared to tear in pieces the imperial edict, "That indeed those Christians were indiscreet, but after all, they were bold and zealous for their religion."

It would be hardly possible for you to say more in favour of so criminal an action, than you do, when you ask "Where is the man who would not prefer a courage and zeal for his religion to prudence?" It is well known that these were the maxims of the league, and it was by no means necessary for you to prove, that if in those days there were priests wicked enough to preach such doctrines to the people, there are others at present who are very unwilling to forget them.

But how dare you to revive those abominable maxims? Can you still hope to find, in the dark clouds of the human mind, dispositions calculated to favour them? Thanks to sound philosophy, against which you declaim to no purpose, mankind have now a just sense of their duties, and you will no longer find amongst them either rebels or regicides. The philosophers, whom you calumniate, because you fear them, will continue to extend the light of reason in spite of your efforts and persecutions; they will persevere in teaching their fellow creatures what they owe to themselves, and to their sovereign; and that horrid monster fanaticism, which has but too long desolated the earth, will remain in your hands, a useless phantom.

II.

Of the different Species of Mankind,

Second Falsity of the Libeller, and a Proof of his Ignorance.

"M. DE Voltaire," says he, in the 3d vol. of his *Essay on the Manners of Nations*, page 182, tells us, that "Human nature, which in all countries is essentially the same,"

“ same, has established the same resemblances betwixt
 “ all mankind;” and in page 6 of the same volume, he
 observes, “ That there are whole nations of a particular
 “ species of men, who in no respect resemble their
 “ neighbours, so that probably there are species of man-
 “ kind as different from one another, as the different
 “ species of animals.”

Obscure theologian, you are asserting untruths. M.
 de Voltaire, in the first of the two passages alluded to,
 where he is noticing the difference between the Japanese
 and us, says, “ Human nature, which in all countries is
 “ essentially the same, hath established other resem-
 “ blances betwixt those people and us;” and in the se-
 cond passage, he says, “ It is probable that the southern
 “ pigmies are extinct, and that their neighbours de-
 “ stroyed them. Thus, several species of men may
 “ have been lost, like several species of animals. The
 “ Laplanders do not seem to resemble their neighbours.”

The reader will perceive that there is hardly a word
 of these two passages to be found in the two quoted by
 the libeller. But even allowing M. de Voltaire to have
 asserted that human nature is every where the same,
 and that there are different species of mankind, only an
 ignorant fellow would discover any contradiction in the
 proposition. And who does not know that the prin-
 ciple of nature is the same in all beings? If the author
 of the libel doubts whether with this same principle
 there can be different species of mankind, we refer him
 to himself; let him judge whether betwixt him and M.
 de Voltaire there exists any other affinities, than this
 common principle of human nature.

III.

Of Michael Servetus.

Third Falsity of the Libeller.

“ M. DE VOLTAIRE”, says the libeller, in the
 third volume of his *Essay on the Manners of Nations*,
 “ asserts

“ asserts that Michael Servetus, who was burnt alive
 “ at Geneva, by order of Calvin, denied the eternal
 “ divinity of Jesus Christ”; and in the following page
 he informs us, that “ Servetus did not deny this dogma.”

The audacity with which these gentlemen invent absurdities, for the sake of saying impertinent things, is truly marvellous.

On looking into the *Essay on the Manners of Nations*, Vol. III. page 3, the reader will find Servetus spoken of, in the following manner: “ He adopted in some
 “ measure the ancient dogmas of Sabellius, Eusebius,
 “ and Arius, which having long predominated in the
 “ East, were embraced in the sixteenth century, by
 “ Lelio Socini;” and in page 113, M. de Voltaire, after relating the manner in which Calvin caused Servetus to be put to death, adds, “ But what increases our
 “ indignation and pity is, that Servetus, in the works
 “ which he published himself, acknowledges in plain
 “ terms, the eternal divinity of Christ.”

If M. de Voltaire had not taken notice, that “ Servetus in the works published by himself, acknowledges the divinity of Christ; we might excuse the author of the libel, for attempting to make these two passages appear contradictory to each other, but after such partial and inaccurate quotations, we leave him to the contempt he deserves.

IV.

Of CROMWELL.

Fourth Falsity of the Libeller.

I SHOULD be glad to know in what part of the first volume of the *Literary Miscellanies**, which he has the impudence to quote, he finds M. de Voltaire saying, that “ Cromwell, from the time he usurped the royal
 “ authority, never slept two nights together in the same

* Melanges de Litterature.

“ chamber,

“chamber, because he was continually in fear of being
“affassinated, and that he died before his time of a
“fever occasioned by uneasiness.”

In what part of the 5th chapter of *the Age of Louis XIV.* does M. de Voltaire say, that “Cromwell respected the laws?” This theological critic, though not very accurate in his quotations, is at least very fruitful in invention.

Of all that he has thus attributed to M. de Voltaire, concerning Cromwell, these words only, “that he died
“before his time,” are true; all the rest† are fabricated by the libeller himself.

When Cromwell had obtained the sovereign authority, he experienced all the anxieties and perplexities that are its inseparable attendants; to these was added the uneasiness that accompanies usurpation, from the fear of losing an illegal authority, and an anxiousness to preserve it. This is what induced M. de Voltaire in the first volume of his *Miscellanies*, to remark of Cromwell, that “He was poor and restless till the age of
“forty-three; after which he imbrued his hands with
“blood, led an uneasy life, and died before his time.”

This usurper, who on account of his genius and talents, truly deserved to reign, endeavoured to gain the affections of the English, in order to preserve his authority; he did not respect the laws himself, but he caused them to be respected by others. M. de Voltaire has remarked this in the following passage, in his *Age of Louis XIV.* “He strengthened his authority by
“knowing how to relax it on proper occasions; and he
“was careful not to infringe on any of the privileges
“of which the people were jealous;” and in the same work he says, “It is by no means true that he acted
“the enthusiast and the false prophet on his death-bed;
“but it is certain that he died with the same fortitude
“of mind he had testified during his lifetime.” We

† M. de Voltaire seems to have forgot what he has said of Cromwell, in the preceding Essay. See the latter part of chap. clxxxi. T.

defy the malice of the libeller to point out a single contradiction in these different passages.

It was Cromwell's maxim to shed the blood of every powerful enemy, either in the field of battle, or by the hands of the executioner. This has induced M. de Voltaire to say, that "he imbrued his hands with blood;" but this did not hinder him from relaxing his authority on proper occasions, from taking care to see justice rigorously administered, or from cultivating the good will of his people; he had occasion for these as a support, while he sacrificed those who might be hurtful to him. Thus, he was at once tender with regard to his subjects, and cruel to his enemies; he led a life of uneasiness, but constantly preserved a great degree of magnanimity, which he evinced even in his latest moments.

Such is the character of Cromwell, and such the manner in which M. de Voltaire has delineated it. Every one who has studied the history of that extraordinary man, will acknowledge that M. de Voltaire has said no more of him than what is true, and yet this is what the ignorant and inaccurate libeller calls contradiction.

The reader may form an idea of the rest of the libel, from the articles we have now refuted. In good truth, they were not worthy of the trouble, but it seemed right to prove, that the errors attributed by the libeller to M. de Voltaire, are nothing more than the tricks and deceptions of an abusive writer, and that the praises lavished on him by his illustrious apologist, ought to be considered in no other light, than as a panegyric of crimes, lies, and ignorance, composed by an accomplice.